

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXCIV.]

FEBRUARY, 1861.

[VOL. XVII.]

MASSEY'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND.*

THE History of England, according to the revised idea of what true history is, can scarcely be executed by one pen. All that an individual mind can reasonably hope to effect is to write the history of some one well-defined period, such as a single reign, or at most the successive reigns of one dynastic family. To the disappointment of all true lovers of historical literature, the larger schemes of Mackintosh and Macaulay were frustrated, in the one case by dilatory literary habits, and in the other by broken health and a death which seemed untimely. Warned by experience, we must not dare to confide so wide a subject as the History of England to the grasp of a single mind or life.

Historical composition has undergone a revolution as remarkable as any of the political changes which revolutions have introduced. Partaking of the enlarged sympathies which mark our age, history no longer limits its view to the rise and fall of kings, to the intrigues of statesmen and ecclesiastics, and the victories or fate of armies and their commanders; but has an eye and voice for the people, their employments, their virtues and vices, their delusions or their improvement, and for social progress in all its phases. The very title of the work of which we desire to say something marks the change; it is not the History of the Reign of George the Third, but "A History of England during" that reign. Leaving much that was once too exclusively regarded as history to his predecessors in historical composition and their future imitators (if such shall be), Mr. Massey declares at the outset that his aim is to follow with some minuteness the progress of society, and to describe the manners of its various orders, the court, the aristocracy, the middle classes, and the labouring people. Whether our author has fulfilled his promise, it would perhaps as yet, as only three-fourths of his intended work have seen the light, be premature to decide.

The history of England during the first sixty years of the last hundred is a subject well worthy of an historian's labour. Never probably in the history of the world were greater political and social changes inaugurated and in part effected than in the cen-

* A History of England during the Reign of George the Third. By William Massey, M.P. Vols. I.—III. 8vo. London—Parker and Son.

ture which followed the accession to the throne of the third George. The reign of that monarch, so pregnant with political blunders and misdeeds, furnishes a good text to any man capable of expounding the philosophy of history.

We dare not give Mr. Massey our confidence as a political philosopher. The work before us contains satisfactory evidence of literary skill, of considerable industry in gathering new materials in some departments of his task, but nowhere inspires us with the feeling that we are viewing a critical period of modern history through the judgment of a man of broad views and high aims. We are not unwilling to receive Mr. Massey's work with a feeling of welcome; it is a contribution to our national history of perhaps more than average value. But that value is chiefly derived from the official habits and knowledge of the writer. The tactics of parliamentary warfare are effectively described by one who has for years lived in the midst of it and taken part in its exciting, if not always glorious, combats. We feel more confidence in our author's estimate of the talent for debate or for political intrigue, than in his judgments on individual character and on national policy. In one respect Mr. Massey's labours are happily timed. There is no longer any necessity for respecting the secrets of a past century; letters and diaries long scrupulously locked up are now accessible to the historian. There is no obstacle to the whole truth being told respecting the reign of George the Third and the men, distinguished or otherwise, who moved around him. No living statesmen are compromised by judgments on public events or a course of policy which was initiated a century ago. It is true we have on the throne a granddaughter of George the Third; but except in the strict decorum preserved at court, there are few features of resemblance between him and the illustrious lady who now rules over this kingdom. To write freely respecting the political errors of the monarch who found no ministers to his mind during his long reign, save his creature Lord Bute and the facile Lord North,—to visit with the moral censure it deserves his want of honour in his dealings with the ministers he employed,—to expose all the disastrous results of his violations of constitutional government and of his ambition to rule without a responsible minister,—to do all this is not to disparage, but by contrast to panegyricize, the present occupant of the throne. If there have been serious errors in the policy of Queen Victoria, it remains for the future historian to detect and censure them. It is indisputable that her policy has been as little swayed by irresponsible favourites as by personal prejudices, and that in every step of her public life she has walked in the well-defined track of the Constitution, giving her confidence only to the ministers approved by Parliament, and behaving with scrupulous honour to each successive minister, whether Liberal or Conservative.

Seldom has a monarch ascended a throne under circumstances more hopeful or larger in promise of honour to himself than the third George. Unlike his two ancestors of the same line and name, he was born and bred in the country of which he became undisputed sovereign. Had his own father, Frederick, lived to succeed to the throne, there would have been the painful recollection of his unseemly misunderstandings with his father and Queen Caroline, and the court would have been embittered by antipathies or corrupted by predilections growing out of old state intrigues and personal collisions.

This is Mr. Massey's description of George III. at the time of his accession :

"Deprived of his father at an early age—a bereavement, however, which cannot be considered a misfortune—he was brought up under the eye of his surviving parent, a princess who had deeply imbibed the exaggerated notions of sovereignty which prevailed in the petty courts of the continent. Her chief object, apparently, was to establish her own influence over the mind of the Heir Apparent. It must have been with this view that she kept him always at home, seldom allowing him to go to court, or to associate with young people of quality. For the same reason, the dignified governors, whom the King placed about his grandson, were treated by the princess with marked coldness and reserve, while their authority was set at nought by the sub-preceptors, who had been appointed by her royal highness."—I. 58.

"Lord Waldegrave, a shrewd observer, and a devoted adherent of the House of Hanover, has drawn the character of his royal pupil. A less amiable portrait has seldom been delineated. The Prince is described as not altogether deficient in ability, but wholly without power of application; strictly honest, but without the frank and open behaviour which makes honesty amiable; sincerely pious, but rather too attentive to the sins of his neighbours; resolute, but obstinate, and strong in prejudices; having his passions under command, but with a certain unhappiness in his temper, which Waldegrave thus describes: 'Whenever he is displeased, his anger does not break out with heat and violence, but he becomes sullen and silent, and retires to his closet; not to compose his mind by study and contemplation, but merely to indulge the melancholy enjoyment of his own ill-humour. Even when the fit is ended, unfavourable symptoms very frequently return, which indicate, on certain occasions, that his royal highness has too correct a memory.' Another passage shows how accurately he had read the Prince's character. Having mentioned the extreme indolence of his nature, he adds:—'When the Prince shall succeed to his grandfather, he will soon be made sensible that a prince who suffers himself to be led is not to be allowed the choice of his conductor. *His pride will then give battle to his indolence, and having thus made a first effort, a moderate share of obstinacy will make him persevere.*'

"Such were the leading outlines of the Prince's character when, at the age of twenty-two, he ascended the throne of Great Britain. Time may have softened some of the harsher traits, but the prominent features as drawn by this master-hand can be distinctly traced in after life. The indolence giving way to a stubborn tenacity of power; the reserve

and dissimulation; the intolerance of prejudice; the lively recollections of injuries; the more than royal forgetfulness of services—all these qualities are to be found in the great and powerful monarch, as they were discovered and noted in the youthful and secluded heir to the throne. George the Third, when he began to reign, had little or no knowledge of either books or men. With the latter he necessarily became acquainted afterwards; but, unfortunately, kings look upon the least amiable side of human nature.”—I. 60, 61.

“The defects in his education were never supplied. His understanding, naturally sound and not below mediocrity, was enlarged neither by study, nor travel, nor conversation; of letters and the arts he was wholly ignorant. But on matters, the discussion of which does not require much cultivation of mind, administrative and political details, he generally went to the point; and according to the measure of his capacity and information, acquitted himself with shrewdness and good sense.”—I. 63.

To some extent Mr. Massey defends the resolute anti-Whig policy of the King, treating it as a not unnatural determination on the part of the Sovereign to rid himself of the domination of a haughty oligarchy, which had in the two preceding reigns monopolized the power and patronage of the government. But were we disposed to grant that the Tory party had in 1760 purged itself of disloyalty and Stuart partialities and was no longer ineligible to office, the mode in which the King wrought the overthrow of the Whig party was incompatible with truth and honour. There might not be that elaborate system of a double Cabinet of which Burke so ably drew the picture, but there is no doubt whatever that the party known as “the King’s Friends” (a party of mere political janissaries) existed by the direct personal influence of the Monarch, and was trained and inspired by the will of the King himself and directly rewarded by his bounty. By the intrigues of these men, the King’s nominal government was an instrument without power. “Its policy was thwarted, its credit undermined, and its existence terminated, at any time, in the face of Parliament and the country, by an unseen, mysterious power.” Mr. Massey admits a few facts respecting Bute:

“He astonished and alarmed the Duke of Newcastle by quoting the King’s personal pleasure as a reason for everything that was done or ordered to be done. He named the court candidates at the general election; and rated the First Lord of the Admiralty for having presumed to dispose of the Admiralty boroughs without the King’s express directions.”—I. 68.

Mr. Massey disputes the propriety of the application to Bute of the term “favourite” in its odious historical sense. He admits that this narrow-minded and pedantic minister taught his master the policy which characterized his reign and helped him to carry it into effect. The reason why our author disputes the application of the term to the minister of George the Third is, that eventually the King discarded his servant when he had lost the

power of rendering him service, and scarcely saw his face after. It does not surely mend the matter as far as the King is concerned, to shew that he wanted the one virtue of fidelity and gratitude to the servant who had destroyed his reputation by carrying out too well his master's wishes.

We find in Mr. Massey's third volume a striking description of the policy and the instruments by which the King eventually gained his point and drove the Whigs from his council-board :

"After the failure of Lord Bute, the King adopted a secret and tortuous policy as best adapted to his purpose. He fomented the jealousies which had long existed between the great Whig houses. He organized a small and select band of individuals, mostly too obscure and insignificant to have any dependence but on his favour, or any opinion but his will. These men he provided with seats in Parliament, with small offices and pensions. Their business was to collect information, to fetch and carry tales, to listen, to whisper aside, to act as spies on the ostensible Minister, to counterplot his plans, to undermine his credit, and, when required by special order, to vote against him in Parliament. These people were flattered by the title of the King's Friends; a designation intended also to be significant of the thralldom in which His Majesty was held by those who pretended to call themselves his Public Servants. We have seen how Ministry after Ministry languished and sunk under the insidious operation of this system. It was in vain, that one statesman after another struggled to get free from the toils which surrounded him. Remonstrances, menaces, stipulations were employed in turn. As it was a necessary part of the plan that the cabal should be disavowed, every attempt to crush it was eluded. If the chief of His Majesty's Government complained that certain subordinate officials had intrigued or voted against his measures, the King would very decorously express his displeasure, and go through the form of reproving the delinquents. If the great man, on being summoned to the royal closet, made it a condition of his accepting the seals of office, that there should be no secret agency, the pledge was readily given; for the existence of secret agency had never been admitted. Whether it was Grenville who lectured, or Chat-ham who rated, or Rockingham who dictated to his royal master, His Majesty met every form of objurgation with the same passive resistance." III. 238, 239.

To the irresponsible and dishonourable government of the King's Friends succeeded the more direct, but not more independent, government of Lord North. He became the obsequious and in many respects very able agent of the King's wishes, undertaking the responsibility of power without its reality and rewards.

We do not wish a stronger description than we find in this History of the fruits of the tortuous policy of George the Third :

"The results of that administration were, the loss of a great part of his dominions; the addition of one hundred and fifteen millions to the Debt; war with three of the maritime powers of Europe; a hostile league of his former allies; his coast threatened with invasion, and British waters swarming with the cruisers of his numerous enemies; nay, British

merchants chartering foreign ships, because the flag of their own nation was no longer a protection to their property.

"The nation was on the brink of ruin; and it is probable that her ruin would have been consummated, but for some compensatory circumstances, which lay beyond the control of her blind and obstinate ruler. While the King's Government was losing a great empire in the West, private enterprize had reared from its foundations a still greater empire in the East. While orators and statesmen were engaged in debates about election contests, matters of privilege, and questions of ephemeral or personal interest, the advancing prosperity of the nation, and its progress in the arts of civilized society, are to be traced in the private legislation of Parliament. The Inclosure Acts, the Road and Canal Acts, the Paving and Lighting Acts, which are supposed to concern only the local and personal interests of the parties who solicit them, formed by far the most important part of the transactions of Parliament, from the commencement of the reign, until the end of the American war. But, above all, it was by the inventive genius of the Lancashire artisans, that England was compensated for the fatuity of her rulers. The steam-engine and the spinning-jenny opened up new sources of wealth and power; and Watt and Crompton have given us a commerce of a hundred millions with free America, in lieu of a barren sovereignty which we could not have retained."—III. 77—79.

Selfish and dishonourable as the policy of the King was, we must not ascribe to it all the evils which developed themselves during his long reign. There were influences at work when George the Third ascended the throne which would have made the task of good government difficult to a sovereign resolutely patriotic as well as able. There was a rooted spirit of corruption in the nation, affecting nearly all classes in the commonwealth. Statesmen, the clergy, the middle classes and the populace, were sadly devoid of generous and noble aim. The young as well as the old were alike wanting in patriotic fervour. Horace Walpole tells us that in the second rebellion the students of Cambridge were so little affected by the threatened march of the Pretender upon London, that their chief curiosity and excitement lay in hiring postchaises to take them to the nearest point where Charles Edward's army was expected to pass. In the words of Mr. Massey, "a dull uniformity of selfishness existed amongst politicians, more depressing to a spirit of any generous instincts than occasional or even frequent instances of rapacity or bad faith." "Public men preferred personal objects to every other consideration." The personal morals of public men were in too many instances abominable. The pictures given in Fielding's novels of the levees of great men are regarded by modern readers as ideal creations or gross caricatures. Mr. Massey's sober pages shew that they were life-like portraits.

"It was a custom of those days, for the principal ministers of state to hold daily levees, which were attended by people who had public business to transact, who had favours to ask, and who sought to keep themselves in the eye of the great man. Bishops and reverend aspirants

of every class, members of both Houses who wanted their jobs done, men about town who wanted a place or a borough, mayors and corporations who had boroughs to sell, agents, pamphleteers, coffee-house politicians—ordinarily composed this motley assemblage. And as each principal minister usually stood upon his own credit, independently of, and sometimes in open opposition to, his colleagues, a First Lord of the Treasury, or a Secretary of State, could collect from the daily attendance at his receptions, a pretty accurate opinion as to the stability of his position. After any mark of court favour had been shewn him, or after a successful struggle in Parliament, his saloons were thronged. And it often happened that the first significant intimation a minister received of his declining power, was in the absence of some vigilant and far-sighted jobber or place-hunter, who had gone over to a rival. For many years, the levees of Sir Robert Walpole were always crowded; the attendance diminished after the failure of the Excise scheme, and the death of his firm and faithful patroness, Queen Caroline. But the Duke of Newcastle had the largest number of clients. The well-known mansion in Lincoln's-Inn-Fields was, during a succession of years, resorted to as the most extensive mart of patronage that had ever been opened in this country; and probably Newcastle gave, or rather bartered away, more places than any minister before or since. It was said, that almost the whole of the bench of bishops had been filled by him; and every department of the public service was crowded with his creatures."—II. 53—55.

Of the clergy of the last century, Mr. Massey has continued the picture given us by Lord Macaulay of their predecessors in office, and it is painted in colours uniformly dark. Take as a sample his description of the educated clergy :

"The more refined and educated class of clergymen, though their lives and characters were not, like some of those who have been named, positively disgraceful to the order, contributed little to its utility. If the parson had the manners of a gentleman, he had likewise the tastes and habits of polite society. Instead of passing his time in field-sports and drinking bouts, he was to be seen at fashionable assemblies, or sauntering at watering-places, or in attendance at the levees of great men. The aim of a clergyman, who frequented good society, was to obtain some preferment which would at once flatter his pride and enable him to live in luxury. With this object, he was not nice as to the services he rendered his patron. Sometimes he accompanied the young heir on the grand tour, nominally as a preceptor, really as a servile companion. If he had a ready pen, he would, perhaps, be engaged to write pamphlets or newspaper paragraphs in the interest of his employer. More frequently he was used as an agent for electioneering purposes; and, in that capacity was required to employ the local influence derived from his position as rector or curate; nor did he scorn to be the channel through which the vile wages of corruption were dispensed. Too often, indeed, he was charged with rendering his patron still more scandalous services. The high places in the Church—bishoprics, deaneries, and stalls—were filled chiefly from this class of clergymen; and it is easy, therefore, to believe that the imputations which were lavishly cast upon the *morals* and principles of the dignitaries of the establishment were not wholly false and calumnious."—II. 42, 43.

One form of vice prevailed in circles high and low, but in the higher circles ate like a canker into the morals and well-being of society; this was gambling. It had, as the comedies of that age shew, tainted both sexes, and in its disastrous results hurled down some of the most noted families of the kingdom. Another fearfully powerful obstacle to civilization was the prevalence of intemperance. "Drunkenness," says Mr. Massey, "was the common vice of the middle and the lower orders. . . . No loss of character was incurred by habitual excess; and it would have been considered a very strange and frivolous objection to a citizen who aspired to the dignity of alderman or mayor, that he was an habitual drunkard."

A curious narrative is given us by Mr. Massey, on the authority of the letters of the first Lord Bolton, who enjoyed official and confidential intercourse with Pitt, which will illustrate not only the hard drinking which in 1784 was more than tolerated in the higher circles, but also the kind of treasonable talk (like that now indulged in by some Irish simpletons, ambitious of notoriety and too deficient in brains to obtain it in a respectable fashion) which some of the King's subjects then uttered. The hero of this singular story was the Earl of Bristol, who then enjoyed the Bishopric of Derry:

"In the month of August, 1784, two young officers of a regiment quartered at Coleraine, visited the Bishop's palace in the vicinity, for the purpose of seeing the paintings and other objects of interest, for which the palace was famed. The gentlemen were received by the Bishop himself with the utmost politeness; and, after shewing them every attention, he induced them to honour him with their company at dinner. Among the guests, which consisted principally of military men, were the Bishop's son, Colonel Hervey, who commanded the battalion in the district, three other field-officers, two of them in command of regiments, and the two subalterns from Coleraine. During dinner, nothing could exceed the good breeding and amenity of their dignified host; but no sooner was the cloth removed than the scene changed. The Bishop began by drinking the health of his son, who was present. 'Gentlemen,' said he, 'this is Colonel Hervey of the Coleraine battalion; he is your superior officer, and will shortly try the stuff you are made of; I hope that ere long we shall meet in the field.' One of the company, somewhat disconcerted at this unexpected intimation, said he hoped they should meet as friends. 'Never, sir,' answered the bishop; 'I am happy to see you under this roof as gentlemen, but in a military sense I shall never look on you as friends.' Upon this, one of the subalterns interposed a hope that his lordship, as a divine missionary, would appear in the field with his book of prayer to preach peace. '*Pax queretur bello,*' was the reply. The Bishop went on to contend with eagerness, that the time was now arrived when Ireland should erect herself into an independent state. A gentleman present could not restrain himself from declaring that he gloried in the name of Englishman; and the *Earl of Bristol* being an Englishman also, he was surprised at the difference in their sentiments. The Earl replied, that

he was at one time an Englishman; but it was no longer his boast. He hoped to see the union of England and Ireland dissolved; he was of opinion, that no country could be better prepared for a revolution than Ireland was at that time: and he looked forward to the day when Ireland should be as independent of England as America was. The whole company was at this time in a flame with wine and indignation, 'for,' says one of the narrators of this scene, 'we were all drunk, he (the Bishop) likewise. I left the room unable to contain myself any longer, trembling with passion.' Other guests followed the example of this gentleman; and the party soon afterwards broke up."—III. 270, 271.

With all these elements of corruption at work, it may seem marvellous that England did not sink through degeneracy into irretrievable ruin. There were, however, compensatory principles and powers in operation, to one or two of which allusion has already been made in the language of Mr. Massey. Amidst prevailing corruption of manners in the higher ranks, there was in the middle classes a general respect for religion and sound morality. The strict decorum of the court strengthened in every rank the influence of those who were desirous of upholding the good and repressing the bad. Trade, which found in Mr. Pitt a sagacious and successful protector, was rapidly developed; and in commerce, when conducted on fair and sound principles, there are many influences favourable to individual virtue and general prosperity. Education, little as it was aided by the universities and the clerical order, began to gain ground at a greater ratio than in any preceding reign.

No historian that we have met with has in this period done justice to the Protestant Dissenters, and the influence they exerted during the last century on the national intelligence and welfare. They were loyal to the House of Hanover when disloyalty was rampant in one at least of the universities, and was deemed no impeachment to the clergy. They were the most enlightened and successful friends of education, their private and public seminaries taking a high position from the first, and conferring the best education then to be obtained in England. Over the periodical and other literature of the eighteenth century, the Protestant Dissenters, and especially the chief representatives of our own denomination, exercised a large influence, altogether out of proportion to their numbers and social position. Of this, not a hint is to be found in the work before us. Mr. Massey is, indeed, lamentably ignorant of the good work rendered to the state by such men as Foster, Furneaux, Towers, Kippis, Price, Priestley and their coadjutors. Following the track of Burke's misrepresentation, when the great orator had renounced the friendships and forgotten the principles of the better portion of his life, Mr. Massey gives us a miserably depreciatory view of Dr. Price. Of Priestley and his claims on the respectful and reverential gratitude of his country, Mr. Massey is most uncon-

sciously ignorant. So little has his eye familiarized itself with the name of the great philosopher, that he never spells it correctly. The narrative he gives of the disgraceful riots which drove Priestley from his home and eventually from his country, is feeble and cold-blooded as well as inaccurate. Possibly had our author penned this part of his History subsequently to the late Oxford meeting, he would have better understood how it became an Englishman to speak and write respecting this discreditable episode in our history.

This is Mr. Massey's version of the Birmingham riots. Having spoken of the "Revolution Society" and the "Friends of the People," he proceeds thus:

"Other clubs, affiliated to the clubs in Paris, were established in London and the principal towns in Great Britain. The proceedings of one of these associations, called the Unitarian Society, consisting of persons belonging to the denomination of dissenters which its title imported, led to disastrous consequences. Dr. Priestly (*sic*), a teacher of the Unitarian persuasion, a pious and learned man, though of extreme political opinions, had lately employed himself in propagating the revolutionary doctrines at Birmingham, where he resided. He seized the occasion of the death of Dr. Price, who first set the example, which had been extensively followed, of making the dissenting pulpit available for the dissemination of the new political faith, to preach a funeral sermon, holding up the American and French republics as models for imitation in this country. The people of Birmingham, who were, for the most part, still attached to the old-fashioned principles of Church and King, resented an attack upon the fundamental institutions of the country, which they considered alike indecent and unwarrantable. A bitter animosity, such as religious differences frequently create, had long raged between the adherents of the Establishment and the dissenting body in Birmingham; the latter were in possession of most of the municipal offices, and churchmen were practically disqualified from any participation in the local government. The agitation for the appeal of the Test Act in the preceding year had, consequently, caused greater excitement at Birmingham than in any other part of the country; and the open union of dissent with democracy, as promulgated in the sermon of Dr. Priestly, irritated and alarmed the public feeling in that town to a degree which indicated the probability of an outbreak upon any farther provocation. This provocation was unhappily supplied by an indiscreet announcement on the part of the Unitarian Society, at the instance of Dr. Priestly, of their intention to celebrate the anniversary of the destruction of the Bastille, which was held to be the inauguration of the French Revolution, by a public festival in the town of Birmingham. The meeting was preceded by inflammatory handbills, distributed as the projectors asserted, not by themselves, but by their opponents, for the purpose of discrediting their intentions. It was in vain, however, that the promoters of the meeting disavowed all connection with the offensive handbills; a strong feeling against the Dissenters was manifested through the town; and the principal persons concerned in the arrangement of the dinner were disposed, under the circumstances, to relinquish their purpose. But the counsels of the rash and violent, as usual in such

matters, prevailed; and though many of the respectable persons who had been engaged in the preliminary proceedings, and among them Priestly himself, refused to attend the celebration, a diminished number of about eighty persons assembled on the appointed day, the 14th of July. A great crowd gathered outside the building, and assailed the guests as they arrived with hootings, execrations, and shouts of 'Church and King!' The crowd increasing in number and excitement, the dinner-party was abruptly terminated, and the company separated at an early hour. The populace having demolished the windows of the hotel, dispersed, intent on mischief and plunder. A Dissenting Meeting-house was set on fire; another was pulled down. One portion of the mob proceeded to the house of Dr. Priestly in the suburb, and set it on fire, the family having barely time to make their escape. The library, philosophical apparatus and manuscripts, containing the labours of a life devoted until lately to scientific investigations, were utterly destroyed. The houses of several other obnoxious persons were, in like manner, burned or battered down. The riots continued, without effectual interruption from the civil power, from Thursday until Sunday night, when the exhausted rabble were suppressed by a small military force. The damage done during these three days was only measured by the physical capacity of the mob. Not only were numerous houses in the town plundered and destroyed; but several country houses of wealthy individuals were wholly or partially demolished. It was said, that the movements of the mob were directed by persons of superior station; that they were incited by the clergy, and even that the magistracy were unwilling to interfere; but no proof of these allegations was offered either in a Court of Justice, or before the Parliamentary Committee which enquired into these disgraceful transactions. The rabble of a large town are always ready to take advantage of any excuse for riot and plunder. The disturbances no doubt originated in political and religious dissension; but the riots of Birmingham in 1791 had as much to do with the cause of Church and King, as the riots in 1780 had to do with the maintenance of the Protestant faith.

"Twelve persons only suffered the penalties of the law for these outrages. Three were executed; one was pardoned after sentence; the others were punished according to the degrees of guilt proved against them. The rioters who perished in the flames they had raised, and who died of intoxication, were far more numerous than the convicted offenders. The persons whose property had been injured or destroyed, recovered damages from their respective hundreds, to the aggregate amount of about twenty-seven thousand pounds. But no compensation could repair the losses of Dr. Priestly, and Mr. Hatton (*sic*) (*Hutton*), the mathematician. Such, however, was the exasperated state of party feeling, that the misfortunes of these respectable persons were regarded more with exultation than sympathy by those who were opposed to their religious and political opinions. Dr. Priestly appealed to the public both by speeches and writings; but his complaints attracted little notice, and he soon after retired to the more congenial region of the American United States."—III. 462—466.

It would occupy more space than we can afford to exhibit all the inaccuracies and shortcomings of this narrative. Its animus is discreditable to an historian affecting impartiality, and still

more so to a writer who assumes to himself the credit of a lover of civil and religious liberty. When Dr. Priestley is censured for extreme political opinions and for "propagating revolutionary doctrines at Birmingham," it must be remembered that in its early phases the French Revolution was hailed by all the friends of good and liberal government. Was it a crime in Priestley to uphold a political movement which Fox beheld with complacency and hope, and in behalf of which Mackintosh exerted all the energies of his logical mind and eloquent pen? If the political opinions of Priestley were "extreme," they were shared by patriots like Mr. Grey, whose glory it was in age to carry into effect in the statute-book and constitution of England the opinions and principles of fervid youth. Elsewhere Mr. Massey designates Dr. Priestley as a "narrow-minded politician." Such was not the estimate formed by Mr. Bentham, Mr. Mill, and others among our best and calmest writers on political philosophy, who have occasionally acknowledged themselves indebted to Priestley for valuable instruction. It may be true enough that all the liberal politicians of that age held some opinions which a larger experience and time, the great innovator, have stamped as untenable. But such errors were not peculiar to Priestley and his age. Living as they did amidst political corruption of gigantic proportions, and seeing as they did in that foolish and wicked American war the natural working of the spirit of despotism, it is not extraordinary that the conflict for which they girded themselves like brave men, and which they fought out with unflinching though not successful patriotism, should have carried them to some opinions which in calmer times and under happier auspices they themselves would not have approved. Many of the present age, looking back to the times of the Regency and the discreditable government of Castlereagh and Sidmouth, may recal opinions and political action, to which in opposition they were honestly led, which now they look upon without approval. Extreme begets extreme. It is the duty of the historian to point out the errors of both parties. But no one holding an even balance will censure only those errors which have resulted from reaction. Candour will, on the contrary, suggest large allowances for those who, in their eager opposition to manifest wrong, have themselves overstepped the strict line of right.

But some of the inaccuracies of Mr. Massey in this narrative are too gross to be passed over without censure. He speaks of the "Unitarian Society" as though it were one of those "other clubs" which he mentions as being affiliated to the clubs in Paris. Is it possible that he knows so little of the religious history of the country as to suppose that the Unitarian Society was a mere political club? * Unitarians had and avowed their

* Mr. Massey has been trapped into this blunder by too obsequiously following Mr. Burke as his guide. This may help to account for our historian's errors

political opinions, and they had as much right to them as their clerical opponents to theirs. It is also true that Unitarian ministers, following the example of Dr. Price and other truly religious and patriotic men, sometimes used the pulpit for the assertion of important political truths. They were countenanced in this by the bishops and clergy, who were constantly in the habit of preaching political sermons. If we look to the quality of the sermons preached and published by the two parties, Dissent need not blush for the part taken by its advocates. In moderation and religiousness of spirit, as well as in political wisdom, the occasional sermons of the Presbyterian divines of the reign of George the Third will happily contrast with the sermons of members of the hierarchy and beneficed clergymen, preached at Court, before the Lords, and on the 30th of January. It is a very gross blunder on the part of an historian to describe the celebration dinner of the Birmingham liberals of 1791 as an indiscretion of "the Unitarian Society." It was a meeting held irrespective of religious distinctions. The Chairman, Mr. James Keir, of West Bromwich, was in fact a member of the Church of England. He described the meeting, in a letter to the printer of the Birmingham and Stafford Chronicle, as composed "of the friends of liberty and of mankind." He adds, that "the commemoration meetings had nothing to do with religious distinctions, and were composed of Churchmen, Catholics and Dissenters." It is another blunder to describe the meeting as held "at the instance" of Priestley. He himself, in the brief, calm statement in his Autobiography and Appeal, distinctly says that it was no measure of his, and that he had little to do with the affair. There is no evidence that he was engaged in the preliminary proceedings of the celebration. Mr. Massey admits that Priestley himself did not attend the dinner. It is a mistake, again, to say that the persevering in holding the dinner, after the prudence of that step was discussed, was in deference to "the counsels of the rash and violent." It was, in fact, in deference to the opinion and strong wishes of Mr. Dadley, the master of the hotel, who, when the dinner was countermanded, remonstrated and expressed his confidence that there was no danger of any tumult. It may be doubted whether the dinner was in reality the "provocation" to the riot. The guests of the dinner separated at five o'clock, and the riot, for which it is sus-

of spirit as well as errors of statement. Mr. Burke may by his brilliant refutation furnish a shelter in matter of opinion, but not in a false statement. The great orator's mistake in this matter was pointed out by Dr. Priestley himself: "Mr. Burke was ignorant that the *Unitarian Society* by no means represents the Unitarians of England, being nothing more than the association of a very few of them for the purpose of distributing books, and certainly not one in a thousand of the Unitarians in England. That Society has no political object whatever. . . Unitarianism bears no relation to any system of politics."—Appeal to the Public, Part ii., Preface.

pected preparations were carefully made, did not begin till about eight o'clock. When Mr. Massey speaks of "plunder" as one of the objects of the rioters, the statement is somewhat against the evidence of facts. When Mr. Humphrys' house was attacked, large sums of money were offered to the mob if they would desist; but they refused, substantially declaring that they sought not plunder but vengeance.

Mr. Massey questions the statement that the movements of the mob were directed by persons of superior station, or that they were incited by the clergy, and that the magistrates were unwilling to interfere. Had he read Dr. Priestley's two Appeals, he would have found facts neither few nor without weight in confirmation of these statements. In his Autobiography the Doctor says, "After the riots in Birmingham, I wrote an Appeal to the Public on the subject, and that being replied to by the clergy of the place, I wrote a 'Second Part,' to which, though they had pledged themselves to do it, they made no reply; so that in fact the criminality of the magistrates and other principal High-churchmen at Birmingham in promoting the riot remains acknowledged." The scanty results of the trials only prove the general and inflamed state of the public mind, and especially in the classes whence magistrates and jurors were drawn. Justice was practically denied to the injured Dissenters of Birmingham. Any one reading the printed trials of the rioters will be amazed at the flimsy defence which procured for some of them a verdict of acquittal. Though £27,000 were awarded by way of compensation, the damage was estimated at nearly ten times that amount.

We have little space left to give to Mr. Massey's work, or we might find other portions of it far better executed than that on which we have felt it a duty to comment. As an important part of the work still remains to be published, we venture to hope that our author will revise the passages that bear on religious liberty and Nonconformity, subjects with which it is so apparent he is but imperfectly acquainted.

This is the unsatisfactory manner in which he describes the last attempt of Fox (in 1792) to repeal the Test and Corporation Acts:

"A motion by Fox, made at the instance of the Unitarian dissenters, not for the redress of any specific grievance, but rather with a view, which the non-conformist body had lately manifested, of provoking a renewal of the old quarrel with the Establishment, gave rise to some animated debate. Burke, who recognized the hand of Priestly in this motion, broke forth in a violent invective against that respectable philosopher and narrow-minded politician, who appeared to his vision only as the Birmingham incendiary. He treated the motion as an attack on the Church; and he connected the attack on the Church with the systematic invasion on all the institutions of the country by the party in connection with the French revolutionists. The ostensible object pro-

posed by Fox was the repeal of certain obsolete statutes, which no one wished to revive; but the dissenters were at this time in bad repute with the House, and the motion was rejected by a large majority."—III. 477, 478.

Short as the statement is, it has something objectionable in nearly every line. But the errors are such as the intelligent reader will detect for himself, and we conclude with the remark that the day is gone by for writing history in this slipshod manner, and, instead of carefully sifting facts, retailing the weak prejudices of a bygone age. Burke closed his life by resisting and denouncing much that he had advocated in his earlier and better days. But time has confirmed by its verdict the aspirations of his first, and rejected and cast for ever aside his latter, political philosophy. The rights of conscience are now respected and conceded. They who struggled and suffered for them are no longer called incendiary politicians; and they who are attached to the Church of England see her strength increased, not diminished, by a course of moderation and tolerance.

WILLIAM PITT AND HIS DEBTS.

ALL parties in the House of Commons readily concurred in voting £40,000 to satisfy the demands of Pitt's creditors. Some of his admirers seemed to consider the magnitude of his embarrassments as a circumstance highly honourable to him; but men of sense will probably be of a different opinion. It is far better, no doubt, that a great minister should carry his contempt of money to excess, than that he should contaminate his hands with unlawful gain. But it is neither right nor becoming in a man to whom the public has given an income more than sufficient for his comfort and dignity, to bequeath to that public a great debt, the effect of mere negligence and profusion. As First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, Pitt never had less than £6000 a-year, besides an excellent house. In 1792, he was forced by his royal master's friendly importunity to accept for life the office of Warden of the Cinque Ports, with near £4000 a-year more. He had neither wife nor child; he had no needy relations; he had no expensive tastes; he had no long election bills. Had he given but a quarter of an hour a-week to the regulation of his household, he would have kept his expenditure within bounds. Or, if he could not spare even a quarter of an hour a-week for that purpose, he had numerous friends, excellent men of business, who would have been proud to act as his stewards. One of these friends, the chief of a great commercial house in the city, made an attempt to put the establishment in Downing Street to rights; but in vain. He found that the waste in the servants' hall was almost fabulous. The quantity of butcher's meat charged in the bills was nine cwt. a-week. The consumption of poultry, of fish and of tea, was in proportion. The character of Pitt would have stood higher if with the disinterestedness of Pericles and of De Wette, he had united their dignified frugality.—*Lord Macaulay.*

THE HYMNOLOGY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.*

IF now we cast a look back on what has been set forth, we find, 1, an Old-Testament phase of Christian song; 2, a period of transition; 3, a New-Testament phase; 4, a post-biblical phase in two sub-classes, a more pure and a less pure. All these are Unitarian; only in the peculiar scenery of the Apocalypse an address to Christ has been introduced, which finds itself repeated in the less pure of the 4th or post-biblical phase. In no way does that address compromise the grand and central doctrine of the Divine Unity; yet it is easy to see that when the peculiar circumstances no longer existed, the address might be repeated, and not repeated only, but made more comprehensive. Indeed, when scope had once been given to the imagination or the feelings, the descent to the worship of Christ was easy, if not inevitable. The readier would the descent be, because the hymn, partaking of the latitude, not to say licence, of poetry, would encourage and even invite a practical disregard to the rigid truths of monotheistic worship. Indeed, it may be safely asserted that all the falsities of religious worship in the world have had their birth in the rank and teeming womb of an untutored and unchastened imagination. The greater is the need that those who have taken on themselves the lofty but arduous task of proclaiming and maintaining "the simplicity which is in Christ Jesus," should be jealously careful to cleave to and preserve the pure monotheistic worship of the Bible; and as it was in connection with sacred song that the first downward step was set, so ought they to keep watch and ward day and night to preserve the collections of hymns they employ in their public worship from all impure elements whatever.

Figures of speech which are at once the offspring and the instruments of the imagination have in all ages largely contributed to the falsification of religion. As in the higher flights of our mind we make a direct address to inanimate objects as if they were animate, and to absent ones as if they were present, so did men readily grow habituated to invoke their deceased relatives or fellow-countrymen of mark and renown. All literature is full of examples, nor by any means least the literatures of ancient days and eastern climes. This, which the rhetoricians would pass quietly over as simply so many *prosopopæas* (addressing impersonal beings as personal), might easily become personifications, and to personify a religious benefactor is to make him into a god. Thus from simple invocation the heart of the Christian church was seduced into adoration, and those who began to invoke Christ as they might in loving and grateful reverence invoke the name or the shades of a departed friend, were soon misled to invoke the Spirit of God as a separate personality, then to invoke the

* Continued from p. 27.

three separately, then to invoke the three in one; and could not consistently stop until they invoked, and in some sort worshiped, the hosts of heaven and the demigods of the calendar, besides martyrs and confessors and newly-made saints, some little worthy of any honour, how much less of divine. How emphatically do these facts say to every Christian disciple, *Obsta principiis*, which may be translated, "Crush the serpent in its egg"!

Ephesus and Colossæ, the cities to which Paul addressed the letters to which we have referred, were situated in Asia Minor, of which the former was the Roman capital. Some forty years after the date of the Epistles, the proconsul Pliny, in endeavouring to sustain the then rapidly sinking polytheism, came into contact of no friendly nature with Christian converts, who were rapidly multiplying on all sides. Wishing to consult his imperial master, the emperor Trajan, as to the exact degree of severity he should employ for the suppression of the new religion, he wrote to that prince a letter, in which he reported that so far as the statement of the Christians themselves went, their greatest fault consisted in their assembling on a stated day before it was light to "sing among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ as to a god." What is the best rendering of the most important words in this passage, namely, *carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem*, admits of some difference of opinion. That which has been followed above rests on the authority of Dr. Lardner, who adds, "This is a heathen way of speaking;" "heathen people being willing (accustomed) to deify eminent men, might naturally enough say the Christians worshiped Christ as a god." Allowing, however, that Mr. Melmoth's rendering of *carmen* as "a form of prayer" is "as proper as my own," he remarks, "Pliny's *carmen Christo quasi deo* may have been a prayer to God in the name of Christ." Without denying the possibility of this view and the meaning hence deduced, we think that the phrase, *carmen Christo quasi deo dicere* (literally, to say or utter a song to, or in honour of, Christ as a god), simply signifies to celebrate the high praises or commemorate the transcendent excellences of Christ as their divine teacher and guide. The celebration was made in verse; for though *carmen* may denote a formulary in prose, it properly and usually denotes a song. That the term *deus*, "a god," from Pliny's pen, means no more than we have intimated, is sufficiently clear from the fact that it was given as an epithet to men of marked distinction, whether the distinction arose from position or culture. Thus the emperor Augustus and his prime minister Mæcenæ are severally called *deus* by Horace (Sat. ii. 6, 52); and Cicero speaks of Plato as *deus ille noster Plato*, "that eminent god, our Plato." Other instances could be adduced. Indeed, under the empire the term *deus* is commonly found on inscriptions and coins as an epithet, e.g. *deo Augusto*, "to god Augustus."

“What Pliny means by *secum invicem*, which I have rendered ‘among themselves alternately,’ I cannot say distinctly.” Such is the candid confession of Dr. Lardner. The particulars into which we have entered respecting the responsive or antiphonal method of singing as practised in the Hebrew worship, serve to make the proconsul’s meaning clear. The exact version of the words is, “with themselves (that is, one with another) by turns.” “To sing one with another by turns,” is a correct description of the antiphonal method. That method which we have before seen transplanted out of Judaism into the gospel is here found by Pliny in observance on the part of the Christians of his province.

The hymns sung by the church in the generations which immediately followed the appearance of the principal writings of the New Testament have perished, destroyed probably by the innovating hands of philosophizing and poetizing zeal. In consequence, we are unable to reproduce with certainty the strains in which the Christians of Asia Minor offered their matin song. As, however, that district of the world was favoured with the guarding presence of the apostle John, who, perhaps in view of threatening departures from Christian simplicity, declared that “the true worshipers worship the Father,” and that “the Father seeketh such to worship him” (John iv.), we may be sure that all the churches whom he could influence would abstain from every approach to the worship of Christ. It is therefore not improbable that the *carmen* of Pliny was one of the hymns which we have just transcribed from the Apocalypse. We possess, however, a morning hymn known to have been sung in early days, which recommends itself by being composed of Old-Testament language. If to this we add words concerning Christ presented in the book of Revelation (ch. i.), and appropriate to the state of persecution and hope in which the disciples of Asia Minor then were, we may not impossibly reproduce, at least in substance, what for the sake of distinction we may call

Pliny’s CARMEN CHRISTO, or the Church’s Matin Song.

1st Choir.

Every day will we bless thee,
God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ;
We will bless thy name
For ever and ever.

Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep us this day without sin.
Blessed be thou, O Lord God of our fathers,
And thy name be praised and glorified
For ever and ever!

2nd Choir.

Unto Jesus Christ,
The faithful witness,
The first begotten of the dead,
The prince of the kings of the earth,
Unto him that loved us

And washed us from our sins in his own blood,
And hath made us kings and priests unto God his Father,

Be glory and dominion
For ever and ever!
Amen.

1st Choir. Lo, he cometh with clouds!
And every eye shall see him,
Even they who pierced him;
And all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him.
Even so. Amen.

1st Solo. To him that overcometh
Will I grant to sit with me in my throne,
Even as I overcame,
And am set down with my Father in his throne.

2nd Solo. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to
the churches.

Both Choirs. Thou art worthy, O Jehovah!
To receive glory and honour and power;
For thou hast created all things,
And for thy pleasure they are and were created.
Halleluja! Amen.

The usage of the church in the beginning of the second century, as reported by Pliny, agrees with what is said of it by other high authorities of the same period. We here quote the words of Lardner: "Justin Martyr says, 'In all our oblations we praise the Creator of all through his Son Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit.' And, 'The President gives praise and glory to the Father of all in the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit.' And says Tertullian, 'The God whom we worship is the God who made this whole universe and everything therein by his powerful word.' Again: 'We worship God through Christ. Call him a man if you think fit. It is by him and through him we have been brought to the knowledge and worship of God. And the Jews themselves were taught how to worship God by the man Moses.'"* These quotations agree with all that has gone before to demonstrate that in their psalmody, as well as their general worship, the primitive Christians offered their gratitude and their adoration to the Almighty in the name of Jesus Christ. In other words, down into the middle of the second century the singing in Christian worship was rigidly Unitarian; not Christ, nor the Holy Spirit, but God the Father, received the devout and glowing homage of the heart as uttered in "psalms, hymns and spiritual songs."

Some generations must have elapsed before the spirit of the gospel could, under the circumstances, have put itself forth in such a literary form as would call forth from the heart original Christian poems strictly so called. So long as the influence of the Hebrew church remained in the ascendant, "the book of

* Lardner's Works, Vol. VII. p. 17, seq. Octavo Ed. London. Dowling. 1827.

Psalms" was the Christian hymn-book. Only when Greek culture together with Greek ideas became strong and prevalent in the church, did "the Psalms of David" give way to the creations of the Hellenico-Christian muse. In the same degree was the primitive Unitarianism forced into the background by the Greek speculation, refinements and systematizing which issued in the Trinity of the pseudo-Athanasian Creed. Accordingly, David's songs (ἑπη Δαυιδικά) became a phrase to denote the older Unitarian poems or psalms in contradistinction to the new compositions, which, as proceeding from innovating individuals desirous of introducing their novel and unchristian speculations into the church under the enticing forms of song and music, received the name of ψαλμοὶ ἰδιωτικοί (psalms of individuals), to distinguish them from the psalms of the church or such as were universally sung in public worship. These novelties in the hymnology were expressly forbidden by the Unitarian bishop of Antioch (about 250 A.D.) on the ground of their being novel as well as their containing false doctrine, while he insisted on the Psalms of David alone being sung.* Paul of Samosata (to whom we have just referred), contending for the pure worship of apostolic days, "abolished," Eusebius tells us, "the psalms which were usually sung in honour of our Lord Jesus Christ as novel and the compositions of modern men;" "for he will not join in a confession with us that the Son of God came down from him."† Abolishing these impure songs on the ground of their novelty, he must have struck a chord which responded in the public mind. His act in consequence argues extended support, and so the wide prevalence of his Unitarian predilections. Nor can it be questioned, whatever orthodox prejudice and hate may have recorded to his detriment, that he was an able and influential man who undertook to resist doctrinal innovations and to restore the simplicity of the psalmody of the Christian church at least in the East. Nor, indeed, can the historian prevent himself from expressly stating that "he is beloved and admired." It deserves notice, too, as shewing that Trinitarianism was as yet barely out of the shell, that the orthodox bishops from whose impeachment of Paul our quotations have been taken, complain that he denied, not the supreme deity of Christ, but simply their doctrine of the descent of Christ from heaven.

The country around Antioch was near enough to Judea to retain for generations the primitive monotheism of the earliest times. After the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, it became, indeed, the Hebraic centre of Christianity. As such it did much to sustain the Christian monotheism of Syria. There the Davidian type of psalmody seems to have long prevailed. Its principal

* See "Select Metrical Hymns and Homilies of Ephrem Syrus, translated from the original Syriac by Dr. Burgess," London, 1853, Introduction, p. x.

† Eusebius, vii. 30.

known cultivator was Bardesanes, who has suffered the universal fate of all who adhered to primitive Christianity in being persecuted for heresy and branded in character. His works, too, are lost. Only from the imputations of his enemies is he known. Ephrem the Syrian, intending to blast his reputation, has, speaking of him, used terms which point him out as espousing the old Unitarian style of sacred song. We cite his words:*

Bardesanes

— composed odes
And mingled them with music;
He harmonized psalms,
He sought to imitate David;
He set in order
Psalms one hundred and fifty.
But he deserted the truth of David
And only imitated his numbers.
— he dishonours the fair name
Of the Holy Spirit.

This Ephrem the Syrian, who lived about a century after Paul of Samosata, made a great stride in corrupting the hymns of the Eastern church, though he stopped short of full-grown Athanasianism. As illustrating one of the ranker fruits of the musical corruption of divine worship, we cite a portion of one of his hymns ("A General Invocation"), in which occurs one of the earliest instances of the association of the Virgin Mary with her Son in the public services of the church:

O Son, begotten divinely,
Of the Father spiritually!
The Virgin Mary purely
Brought him forth bodily,
And he dwelt in her bosom secretly,
And appeared from her publicly:
Behold! is honoured gloriously,
Her memory constantly.
Glory to the Father eternally,
Who chose Mary purely;
And adoration to the Son perpetually,
Who strengthened the martyrs bravely;
Praise to the Spirit perfectly,
Who raiseth us from the dead surely;
And on us be mercies abundantly,
At all seasons unvaryingly!

While the Eastern church had been thus degenerating, and had come to commemorate one ("Mary") who was ere long to be a fourth divinity in the rapidly filling Christian Olympus, the Western church had outstripped its older sister, and was destined to sink into a lower depth, by not only completing the deification of Mary, but offering worship to angels and saints innumerable.

* Burgess's "Hymns and Homilies of Ephrem Syrus," *ut supra*, Introduction, p. xxx.

One portion of the huge collection lies before us in three large octavo volumes, consisting of, 1, "Hymns to God and the Angels;" 2, "Hymns to the Virgin Mary;" 3, "Hymns to the Saints." In the first volume, God, properly so called, is thrown into deep shade by crowds of hymns addressed to the Son, the Holy Ghost, the Trinity. If we measure the honours there given by their number, we find the order to be this: 1st in amount to Christ; 2nd, to the Trinity; 3rd, to the Father; 4th, to the Holy Spirit; 5th, to the Angels. We know not under which of these rubrics to place some of these compositions; as, for instance, the Hymns to the Cross, one or two verses from which we cite as examples of the gross idolatry, resembling the worship of stocks and stones (*feticism*) condemned in the Bible, to which a departure from the scriptural monotheism has led professed disciples of Christ.

Stanzas to "the Holy Cross."

- 1 Salve! crux sancta; salve! mundi gloria;
Vera spes nostra, vera ferens gaudia;
Signum salutis, salus in periculis,
Vitale lignum, vitam portans omnium.
- 2 Te adorandum, te crucem vivificam,
In te redempti, dulce decus sæculi,
Semper laudamus, tibi semper canimus,
Per lignum servi, per te lignum liberi.
- 1 Hail! holy cross; hail! glory of the world;
Our true hope art thou, bringing us true joy;
O sign of our safety, our safety thou in perils,
Living wood, bearing the life of all.
- 2 Adorable cross! life-giving cross!
Redeemed in thee, O loved glory of the world,
We, enslaved by one tree, freed by thee, another,
Praise thee for ever, for ever sing to thee!
- 1 Dulce lignum adoremus,
Dulces clavos veneremur,
Verbum Patris prædicemus
Sollemni præconio.
- 2 Christi crucem adoremus,
Crucifixum deprecemur,
Ut ab hoste liberemur
Crucis patrocinio.
- 3 Ave lignum quod fuisti,
Dignum ferre corpus Christi;
Mundo lapso contulisti
Vitam et imperium.
- 1 The dear wood let us worship,
The dear nails let us revere,
The Father's word proclaim
With solemn heralding.

- 2 Christ's cross let us adore,
The cross-bearer let us beg
To free us from the foe
By the aid of the cross.
- 3 Hail! dear wood; worthy thought
To bear the body of Christ;
On a fallen world thou hast bestowed
Life and dominion.

The second volume, which is the flower of the three, contains four hundred and eighteen hymns in honour of "the Virgin;" of which, three hundred and sixteen are in Latin, forty-one in Greek, twenty-two in Italian, five in French and thirty-four in German. Among the epithets by which "the Virgin" is addressed are these—"God-making Mother," "God-bearing Virgin," "Virgin Mother of God," "Mother of the Great Father's Son," "blessed Queen of Heaven," "the chaste Parent of the great Thunderer," "the Bearer of the Trinity," "the Temple of God," "Mistress of the world," "Hope of the world," "Joy of the world," "Light of the world," "the pious Mother of the world," "the Salvation of the world." The third volume contains five hundred and ninety-four hymns, nearly one-half of the entire collection, addressed to either "the saints in general" or to "individual saints." Beginning with the patriarchs and prophets, the homage extends through the New-Testament worthies and martyrs and confessors, down to St. Achatius, St. George, St. Gerard, St. Januarius, and a long roll of names either generally unknown or known for no good. Popes and the several orders of monks are included in the long roll of objects of worship, being associated in the honours paid to and the services asked of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit and the Trinity.

This unqualified, unrestrained and unblushing idolatry called forth stern rebuke on the part of the great church reformers of the sixteenth century. With one fell swoop the Unitarians of that age struck out of the list of objects of worship, angels, saints, martyrs and confessors. The more consistent of them disallowed also the worship of Christ. The general principle of the Unitarian church was, that as the Father was the only God, so He was the sole Object of adoration in the true sense of the term. Love and reverence were indeed due to Christ, but not worship properly so called, though invocation was allowed in particular cases even by Faustus Socinus himself,—not, however, as a duty, but as a concession to human weakness, to be profited by in emergencies; while that was considered the higher and nobler state of mind which could satisfy its religious wants in worshiping God to the total exclusion of address to his Son.* So fine a distinction displays subtlety of mind rather than a pure and conscien-

* Fock, *Der Socinianismus*, p. 543, seq.

tious sense of scriptural truth. If Christian observances are to be learnt from the frailties of the heart of man, its uninstructed leanings and its fancied needs, the authority of revelation is at an end, religious practice is reduced not only to the varieties but the caprices of individual sentiment, and the first step has been set which will lead some and may lead many—all, indeed, who act consistently—back to the rank worships of Romanism,—nay, back to the pagan worships of departed heroes, benefactors and kinsmen. The invocation of Christ may or may not be worship; but inasmuch as it is one form in which worship utters itself, and which in consequence may easily slide into worship itself, it should never be used at all, or only under such restrictions and guards as demonstrate its true nature and prevent its too easy abuse. The claims of the Creator are paramount. Over those claims the Bible extends its shield; to define and preserve those claims is the office of the faculty of reason; and to yield in so grave an issue to one part of our nature, and that one part the part which is nearest to the animal that is in us, is to frame our conduct, if not learn our duty, from a partial, imperfect and easily misled utterance of that intelligence in whose consentient voice only is found the authority by which God intends man to be guided in conjunction with the words he has pronounced in “holy scripture.”

The great and good men who had the moral courage to revive in England, not without great loss to their worldly interests, the scriptural doctrine of one God the Father and one Lord Jesus Christ, avowed openly their hostility to the worship of Christ and of everything that approximated thereto. It is sufficient, in illustration of this statement, to mention the names of Lindsey, Priestley, Lardner, Belsham. Lindsey went so far as to characterize the worship of Christ as idolatry when practised by persons professing Unitarianism. Even Dr. Price, though an Arian, expressly condemns the offer of worship to Christ. In his volume of Sermons occurs a passage so decided on the point, and bearing in so direct a manner on the evil we have in view and which we desire to check, that we quote the greater part, and that the rather because it expresses not only the pure and true Unitarian style of thought, but the general tenor of Unitarian teaching and practice :

“Amidst all the speculations and controversies about the person and offices of Christ, I wish you would never forget that the only Object of religious worship is the one supreme Deity. This I think a point of great consequence. There is no other being concerning whom we have sufficient reason to think that he is continually present with us, and a witness to all our thoughts and desires. It was to this Being that our Lord himself directed his prayers; and his language to us is, ‘Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve’ (Matt. iv. 10). ‘You shall ask me nothing. Whatever ye shall ask the Father

in my name, He will give it you' (John xvi. 23). This is the scripture rule of worship. We are to pray to God in the name of Christ; that is, as his disciples, and with a regard to him as the Mediator between God and men. To this purpose St. Paul exhorts us in Col. iii. 16, 'Do everything in the name of Christ, giving thanks to God and the Father by him.' The injunction to St. John, when he would have fallen down to worship the angel that shewed him the prophetic visions, in the book of Revelation, we should consider as given to every Christian who is disposed to worship any being except the one Supreme—*See thou do it not; worship God.* All other worship is idolatry, which the Christian religion forbids. The proneness to it, however, among Christians, as well as heathens, has been in all ages melancholy and shocking. The religion of heathens consisted chiefly in the worship of human spirits supposed to have been elevated after their deaths into a participation with the supreme Deity in the government of the world. The religion of Papists is in a great degree the same. Their prayers are directed much more to the Virgin Mary and deified human spirits than to God. Nor are Protestants guiltless. For if the doctrine of the Trinity is false, what must the worship be that is grounded upon it? How much must the reformed churches want reformation! It is the conviction that the true Object of religious worship is God the Father only, that in a great measure makes us Protestant Dissenters. Let us keep on this ground. It is impossible we should find better. To the Saviour we owe an ardent gratitude; but the gratitude we owe to him is nothing compared with that which we owe to the God who gave him, and whom alone we know to be ever near us to hear and notice our prayers and praises."

To the same effect are the following words by the late truly reverend, learned and pious Charles Wellbeloved, who, in his sermon entitled "The Principles of Roman Catholics and Unitarians contrasted" (p. 20), after describing the doctrines held by the latter as consisting mainly in the acknowledgment of "one God, who in scripture is called the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Maker of all worlds and the Governor and Judge of all men; and in the acknowledgment of Jesus as his prophet, commissioned to teach mankind in his name the doctrine of eternal life, and to exemplify this doctrine in his own person by rising from the grave," adds,

"We feel for the character of Christ all the respect and veneration which so much wisdom and goodness naturally excite. If we do not pay him divine honours, it is because he does not appear to us to have demanded them. If he be not the object of our worship, it is because he himself hath set us an example of worshipping the Father only, and is represented in Scripture as our brother, and equally with ourselves the dependent creature of God."

Still nearer to our own times stands the testimony of Mr. Jas. Yates, whose high character and profound scholarship, as well as his intimate acquaintance with the Unitarian body, give special weight to his words. In his excellent sermon on "The Grounds of Unitarian Dissent," he says (p. 39),

"Whether we regard the blessed Jesus with those sentiments of love

and veneration which are due to one of his perfect character and exalted office, it becomes not us to say. But we may affirm that on account of the unblemished purity of his life and the elevated principles by which he was always actuated, his high dignity as the chief of the prophets of God, and the incalculable benefits which through his voluntary sufferings and his unshaken fidelity and zeal have been conferred upon mankind, we are persuaded that his true disciples will honour him more than every other creature. But we wish to evince our gratitude and reverence not by addressing to him praises and prayers, which he would reject and disapprove, but by worshiping in spirit and in truth that Being whom he also worshiped as his Father and our Father, his God and our God."

We cite another authority, that of a man beloved and respected for his truly Christian amiableness as well as his varied culture, the Rev. Dr. Hutton, who in a note to his able discourse, "Omniscience the Attribute of the Father only," makes these remarks:

"That Jesus is to be worshiped as God, I can hardly imagine how any one who has carefully perused the New Testament with an unbiassed mind and a serious view to gain correct information can maintain. That we are allowed to address to him, as 'Head over all things in his church,' a species of subordinate worship, I know to be the opinion of some wise and good men, nor do I pretend to say that such an opinion is altogether devoid of apparent countenance from scripture. I confess, however, that to me this countenance is merely apparent. The expression of fervent gratitude, reverence and love to our Saviour have the direct sanction of many passages of scripture. These, however, are not worship, which, if I understand the term, implies a direct address to the being who is the object of it, and consequently supposes his actual and immediate personal presence. This is not clearly laid down in scripture. Were the case otherwise, I should still fear to offer to the invisible Jesus a species of homage which he seems to have expressly forbidden his disciples to present, and which none of his immediate and inspired followers are recorded, in a single instance, to have offered to him. Can any one point out the passage in the New Testament which clearly authorizes a direct address to our absent and glorified Lord?"

The general doctrine of these quotations runs to this effect,—that worship is offered by Unitarians exclusively to the God and Father of Jesus, and that while they love and revere Jesus, they do not invoke or address him in their religious services. This doctrine was reduced to practice alike in the Reformed Liturgy as first used by Mr. Lindsey in the Essex-Street chapel, London, and in what is commonly known as Kippis's Hymn-book. The example set by that Collection and its Supplement was closely followed for many years in the somewhat numerous hymn-books put out and employed in the Unitarian denomination. The sixth edition of "An Addition to the Supplement of Kippis's Collection of Hymns and Psalms," by the Rev. Edmund Kell, which lies before us, is in this important particular strictly faithful to its model.

J. R. B.

(To be continued.)

THE ANTICIPATED END OF THE WORLD.*

It is notorious that the early Christians, for two or three centuries, cherished a strong though vague expectation of the approaching "end of the age" or "end of the world;" but it is not very clear whether by that phrase they meant a changed state of human life on this earth, or the cessation of the mortal existence of man and the beginning of immortality. Rather, the idea itself was vague and fluctuating. The millennial idea—that of the personal reign of Jesus Christ on earth for a thousand years—presently took its more definite shape. And in spite of the perceived "continuance" of the grand order of Providence as it was "from the beginning of the creation," there are amongst us, in this 19th century of the Christian era, many who read—and we are bound to suppose some who believe—Dr. Cumming's expositions of "The Great Tribulation," "The Coming Struggle," the "Prophetic Destiny of England," and the approaching end of all things in 1868—at which time the Doctor's lease of his house is made terminable at his option, but renewable if his prediction should prove to be mistaken! The belief which is thus burlesqued at present was, however, a real and perhaps a general though not essential belief, in the days of the apostles and for some time afterwards, among the early Christians. It is an important question for the scriptural student, to decide what countenance this belief derived from the apostolic writings, and what (or whether any) from the predictions of Jesus Christ himself.

Miss Hennell's Baillie Prize Essay goes direct to the fountain-head of this inquiry. She asks (as required by the conditions of the proposer of the prize):

I. "Did Christ predict the last day of judgment and destruction of the world, as events inevitable during the then existing generation of men?"

And having answered this question by a merely *probable* affirmative, she proceeds (as if the affirmative were certain) to inquire in Part II.:

"What inferences, theistical or the reverse, are fairly deducible from the non-fulfilment of that prophecy, &c.?"

We shall confine our present remarks almost exclusively to her first Part. Her answer to the first question is candidly admitted by herself to be far from conclusive, though she proceeds to use it as if positive for the basis of the second Part of her Essay. Her own words in summing up the results of the first Part are these:

* Fifth Baillie Prize Essay. The early Christian Anticipation of an approaching End of the World, and its Bearing upon the Character of Christianity as a Divine Revelation, including an Investigation into the primitive Meaning of the Antichrist and Man of Sin, and an Examination of the Argument of the Fifteenth Chapter of Gibbon. By Sara S. Hennell. Manwaring. 1860.

"We have (not, indeed, positive evidence, but) every reason to conclude, that Jesus of Nazareth himself was the primary promoter of that which constituted the belief of his followers: but, at all events, we do know it for an indubitable fact, that an expectation of the above events (though, probably, under a very different conception of them from that now held by Christians,) was entertained by those of his disciples who had been in immediate connection with himself; and that it was promulgated by them with fanatical vehemence and perseverance."—P. 55.

Here are three propositions: (1) that Jesus *probably* was the primary promoter of the belief in question; (2) that *indubitably* his personal followers held it; and (3) that they promulgated it with *fanatical vehemence and perseverance*.

Of the third statement, we must say the writer has adduced no proof whatever. "Fanatical vehemence" nowhere shews itself in connection with the expressions of this belief in any of the New Testament writings, whether, as it seems to be implied, in the records of Christ's prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem by the first three evangelists; or in Peter's possible allusion to it in the book of Acts (iii. 21), or the decided expectation expressed in his Epistles (if the second be his); or in St. Paul's letters to the Thessalonians and Corinthians. We care not to press the doubt whether Mark, Luke and Paul come properly under the description of "those of his disciples who had been in immediate connection with Jesus himself," though this suggestion makes it less clearly right or necessary to identify him with the prevalent belief, still less to point him out as its "primary promoter." But "fanatical vehemence" in the assertion of this belief, is an idle charge against the personal followers of Jesus; for if it be meant to apply to the visions of the Apocalypse, it is too strong a term even there; and we do not suppose Miss Hennell herself would identify the style of "St. John the Divine" with that of John the Apostle. Even "perseverance," whether fanatical or not, in the assertion of this doctrine, is hardly to be asserted of the apostolic writer who has written most largely of all. St. Paul makes the coming end of the world, or of the age, prominent enough in his first Epistle to the Thessalonians, which is the *earliest* of his extant letters (written probably A.D. 52). But in his second letter to them, written within a year after, he labours to mitigate the impression which he had given by his first. And in his first letter to the Corinthians (A.D. 57), in that grand fifteenth chapter which is devoted to the question of the resurrection of the dead, it is remarkable to observe how small a comparative place the still traceable idea of the coming end of the age occupies amid his leading argument for the future life. Then in his second letter to the same church, written in the autumn of the same year, there occur (chap. v. 1—10) that description of the taking down of "our earthly house of this tabernacle" to enter "a house not made

with hands, eternal in the heavens," and those expressions, "mortality swallowed up of life," "while we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord,"—which mark anything but *perseverance* in the more definite and absolute thought of the first letter to the Thessalonians. Now these are the earliest four of Paul's extant letters; and we see how fast this mistaken idea dwindles and vanishes behind the essential thought of immortality. We think we may add that there is no clear allusion, in any subsequent Epistle of Paul, to the doctrine of the *end of the world* as implying any expected change in the physical constitution of our human residence on earth.

The second of Miss Hennell's propositions above quoted is, we agree with her, *indisputable*. The personal followers of Jesus did hold the idea of the coming end of the world. But that a definite thought was uniformly connected with that expression, we cannot admit.

On the first proposition we join issue with her, and maintain that there is no sufficient ground for ascribing to Jesus the belief in question. If by "primary promoter" it be meant to allege that the belief *originated* with him, this must have been written in momentary forgetfulness of the already prevalent Messianic expectations of the Jews, which variously represented to their minds a restored temporal kingdom independent of the Roman sway, and a "kingdom of heaven upon earth" implying more vague conditions, and outlasting the disappointment of the mere temporal hope. If it be only meant that Jesus promoted the vague hope of the Jewish mind, and gave to it the form which we see it had assumed in the early Christian church (say, as represented in the visions of the Apocalypse), then we ask, where is the proof of his having done so?

Is it in our Lord's treatment of the worldly hope with which his countrymen beset and perplexed him at every step? When he declined, till the very end of his ministry, to be publicly called the Christ, because the word, though true, excited false ideas,—when to his disciples who acknowledged his Messiahship he made every such acknowledgment the occasion of announcing his destined sufferings and death,—when he taught that the kingdom of heaven "cometh not with observable signs, but is within,"—when he professed himself a king at Pilate's word, but added, "My kingdom is not of this world,"—do we think it likely that he was cherishing in his own mind a mistaken apprehension almost identical with that already held by the less worldly-minded of the Jews? And if its vestiges still appear in the writings of some of his apostles (whose conversations with him during his life, and even after his resurrection, betrayed their hope of the restoration of the earthly kingdom to Israel), shall we lay this to the account of his instructions, or of their remaining Jewish prejudices? Miss Hennell adopts the former alternative; we main-

tain the latter, as the more credible in itself and alone consistent with our acceptance of Jesus as Lord and Christ. But she seems, in one passage, to concede this very point, and to acquit not only Christ but his apostles of all share in the active origination of the belief:

“It was manifestly no pure invention of their own that produced the prophecy, since the main purport of it was believed before it was recorded; so that it would seem to have been rather the faith that made the prophecy than the prophecy that caused the faith. *And it is remarkable that nowhere in the Epistles is it attributed to Christ as its originator.* It is assumed as something that was well known to be assuredly destined to happen. The Evangelists evidently believed in it fervently themselves; and in all probability they were equally persuaded that Christ believed it too, and that the words they attributed were such as he *might* have uttered,—such as it seemed to them he *must* have uttered.” Pp. 26, 27.

Here the inquiry, whether Jesus predicted the end of the world, would seem to have found the reverse answer to that finally adopted by Miss Hennell. He, in all probability, did not utter any such prediction. His whole method of dealing with the Jewish Messianic expectations proves that he rose superior to them. But his apostles did not, and they clung to them with a natural pertinacity, which may sufficiently account for their having mixed their own thought of the coming end of the world with Christ’s recorded prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem. This is our decided view of the matter. It differs from Miss Hennell’s inasmuch as she denies that Jesus predicted the destruction of Jerusalem. It seems rather wilful to charge upon him so gratuitously the fallacious prediction of the end of the world, and deny him the credit of the other prediction which was historically and amply fulfilled. But Miss Hennell assumes, without (in this treatise) arguing it, the absolute impossibility of miracle, and therefore assumes (without argument or evidence besides) that the Saviour’s reputed prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, recorded in the first three Gospels, must have been written *while the siege was going on*; that what seems a prediction of the real events is therefore a history put into prophetic language, and that what was not fulfilled in the event was the gratuitous expectation of the disciples. Her slashing words are as follows:

“In fact the accounts of this prophecy form our principal means of judging of the light in which we are to look upon the Evangelists. When a recorded prophecy is true down to a certain point, and false beyond it, *the conclusion is irresistible to an unbiassed criticism*, that the writer is giving the fruits of his own knowledge down to his own time, and trusting to conjecture for the rest. In this manner the date of Matthew’s Gospel fixes itself in strong probability between the years 68—70, at the time when the Roman ‘abomination’ had violated the temple, and when the speedy destruction of the city could be perceived to be inevitable.”—P. 24.

At the risk of our criticism being considered not "unbiased," we shall suggest grave reasons for disputing this very absolute decision, and holding a different view of the prophecy in question.

In the first place, we feel with Miss Hennell that "this implies a severe impugnement on the character which we see ought to belong to a faithful historian, to suppose him capable of this false insertion of his own views;" and if we could think with her that "in those times what we call a literary conscience was so little understood" as this allegation against an evangelist implies, the explanation would simply disgust us with the whole subject, and render it impossible for us to speak of the New Testament writers even with that degree of seeming respect with which she treats them in spite of their asserted destitution of literary conscience. Indeed, it is not a mere question of literary conscience with us, whether Jesus Christ predicted the destruction of Jerusalem nearly forty years before it happened, or whether, when the siege was actually going on, a writer of his memoirs put into his mouth a pretended prophecy to that effect. It is part of the question of the truth of his recorded mission to be our Master and Guide.

Then the allegation applies, of course, to all the three evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke, as they all detail the alleged prediction. We should be curious to see this critical conjecture worked out into its details. We should ask, Were all the three evangelists present in Jerusalem in the year 68? all writing the memoirs of Jesus while the siege was going on? It was a strange time for them all to choose for literary labours. And though the opinion seems well founded that Matthew wrote his Gospel in or near Palestine, all opinions and probabilities are against such an origin for Mark's and Luke's. Must the hypothesis be resolved into that of *one* original Gospel having been written during the siege, and of its having been afterwards severally adopted by the three evangelists as the basis of their several narratives? By that time, the siege was over; and the end of the world, which was expected *immediately* to follow, did not follow; whence we must wonder that those who unscrupulously made fact into prophecy did not correct the prophecy accordingly.

This hypothesis of the composition of the first three Gospels during the siege of Jerusalem, we may here observe, contrasts curiously with the general disposition of writers of Miss Hennell's theological class to date their origin as *late* as possible. We must not say the latter is done with a view to disparage their general credibility; but the result of dating their composition late in the second century certainly is to impugn their trustworthiness as memorials of the life of Jesus. And, on the other hand, the surest way to disparage his alleged prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, would be to take it as the journal of

an eye-witness whose literary conscience allowed him to ascribe it to his Master as a prediction. But the early date of the gospel history is, at least, acknowledged in this latter attempt to disparage its prophecy.

To us the argument appears irresistible, against the imagined *late* origin of the Synoptical Gospels, that in the record of Christ's prediction of the end of the Jewish age, there occur a few expressions plainly indicative of the expectation that in connection with that event there would be also something more than really did happen, something that Christians continued to look for and to describe as the end of the world. Nor is its existence in the record difficult to explain. If Jesus Christ really predicted the end of the Jewish economy and the destruction of the holy city and its temple, as events to happen within that generation, and declared that thenceforward the coming of the new dispensation, the kingdom of heaven, the Messiah's spiritual reign, should date,—that the old covenant with the Jewish nation would have come to an end, and the new be opened on equal terms to Jew and Gentile thenceforth,—it is perfectly intelligible to us how Matthew, Mark and Luke, recording his prophecy *before* its fulfilment, might innocently and involuntarily, and with sound literary conscience, give expression to other expectations which Jesus had not uttered, but which their own minds entertained in connection with his words. And their having done so is, to us, the strongest possible internal proof that those Gospels must have been written *before* the destruction of Jerusalem. Had they been composed in the second century, a sincere reverence for Christ would not have permitted the needless ascription to him of anticipations which had manifestly failed of fulfilment; and a less nice literary conscience inventing a prophecy would have been cautious not to invent mistakes so palpable to the world's experience. But the antiquity of the narratives being established, we as easily separate the misconception of the narrator from the main current of the prophecy, as we do the Jewish theory of demons so often implied by the evangelists from Christ's miraculous cures of the insane, the dumb and the epileptic.

This question will be best appreciated through the careful perusal of the chapters concerned, namely, Matt. xxiv. xxv., Mark xiii. and Luke xxi. (the chief portions of which are arranged by Miss Hennell side by side for easy comparison), and by bearing in mind Josephus's history of the siege. Miss Hennell shews clearly how vain the attempt of some critics has been to separate the prophecy into two parts, the one relating to the siege of Jerusalem and the other to the end of the world. Manifestly, in the minds of the writers, the two events were to be *contiguous*, if not identical. But surely she disparages the religious importance of such an event as the discontinuance of the Jewish polity and the transference of the Jewish Theism

into the hands of unexclusive Christian missionaries, when she objects that "there was actually no event immediately following, which can be made to correspond even with the typical description by any possible figure of speech. Within the time specified (she adds), it was the Romans that were the conquerors, not the Messiah" (p. 13). "There is a kind of vainglorious magniloquence in the style. . . . It is making too much of the fall of a petty state" (p. 15). To us, as Christians, the very contrary feeling occurs; and we think even the simple Theist might realize the vast importance of the era which closed the Jewish age to open that of Christianity. We suggest, at least to the serious yet critical reader, the following experiment: Let him take up the Gospel of Matthew (as the fullest of the three) and beginning with our Lord's pathetic lament, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets," &c. (xxiii. 37), let him depart with Jesus from the temple and see the disciples come near "to shew him the buildings of the temple,"—and hear the Lord's distinct announcement, "Verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." Then, as Jesus soon after sat upon the Mount of Olives, let him imagine himself among the disciples coming privately to ask, "When shall these things be; and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the æon?" Let him think how vague was their notion of that æon, and remember how often already Jesus had insisted upon the spiritual character of the gospel age. Then let him read our Saviour's reply, noticing the clear announcement of the false Christs and false prophets, and the extended preaching of the gospel,—of wars, tumults, famines and earthquakes, and the setting up of the "abomination of desolation" (the historical correctness of all which the book before us testifies),—and passing lightly over the comparatively few expressions which colour the predicted end of the age, as if also about to be the end of mortal things, let him take the precept of watchfulness (xxiv. 42—51) and the parable recommending it, as designed for that occasion for which the Christians in Jerusalem *did* watch and on which they *were* enabled by that watchfulness and their belief in their Lord's word to escape the doom of their devoted countrymen;—and then let him read the well-known parables of the *Ten Virgins*, the *Talents* and the *Sheep and Goats*, as the Saviour's manifesto of the great principles of his spiritual reign, the basis of the new dispensation which is to gather together Jews and Gentiles into one before their Heavenly Father, under the guidance of Christ's pure morality, his revelation of immortality and his perfect example. There is unity and completeness, surely, in this order of thought and exhortation. As a proclamation of the Messiah's kingdom, of the abolition of the Jewish specialty, of the obligation of the

grand principles of natural religion as republished in the light of man's revealed destiny and the pure morals of Christianity, he may look upon the prophecy as telling far more than the fall of a petty state or its conquest by the Romans. It was, in this point of view, the Messiah that was the conqueror, not the Romans. The spiritual events immediately following the fall of Jerusalem were strictly appropriate to all the figures of speech clearly belonging to our Lord's prophecy, when we have passed by those which disclose the historian's impression of a coming end of the *world*.

We have confined ourselves to the inquiry whether Jesus Christ himself predicted the "last day of judgment and destruction of the world as events inevitable during the then existent generation of men." Holding strongly the negative of this question, we have not insisted upon a definition of the terms used in it, as we think they ought to be defined by those who maintain the affirmative. The terms ("last day of judgment" and "destruction of the world") are so vague that we may contentedly leave them in their vagueness as representing the thoughts of the Jews of his day and of mystical Christians since; but if ascribed to him as a teacher of positive doctrines, whether with real or assumed divine authority, they ought to be defined before being argued upon.

Miss Hennell's second Part (though of no importance if we answer the question which she has argued in the first Part differently from herself) we cannot pass by without a word or two of acknowledgment for her true-hearted reprobation of Gibbon's mode of attacking Christianity in his celebrated fifteenth chapter,—that "literary *Sneerwell*" rather than philosopher, who is "felt at once to command and insult our understanding," whose representations are "of the very essence of calumny, if not amounting to actual false-witness," and who totally wants that "moral sympathy with the spirit of his subject, without which no author can ever do his subject justice." Miss Hennell repudiates the thought of alliance with such objectors to revealed religion. A more searching exposure of the false-heartedness of his five alleged secondary (but implied primary or sole) causes of the progress of Christianity could not be desired. But having thus set Gibbon aside, Miss Hennell next takes Mr. Martineau to task for "morbid manifestations" in his expressed admiration of the character of Christ, and says:

"We have to accuse Mr. Martineau, just as we have already accused Gibbon, of a deficiency in both of the two respects which are essential: in regard equally to a philosophy that is adequate and to historical fidelity that is thorough. It is indeed true, that we may feel the rose-tints of the former to convey the subject under an aspect that is doubly delightful when contrasted with the blackness suffused over it by Gibbon's gall; but it is none the less necessary that the hue which is given

by poetry to the dawn of our knowledge universally, should be allowed to pass away in its turn, and give place to the simple daylight, always the best for real observation of nature's operations."—P. 100.

In this connection she objects to the idea—not Mr. Martineau's alone—that Jesus was a "realized type of perfection." On the contrary, she insists that, "in the absence of any direct knowledge of the life of Christ (!) . . . when we find that the one effect of his personal influence that *is* certain, is that his immediate disciples were led by it into a still stronger pursuit of the *national fanaticism*, those qualities which were likely to induce such conduct are the ones that, at all events, we require to consider *mainly* characteristic of Christ,"—a description, surely, more applicable to Judas or Theudas than to him who disappointed the national fanaticism at every step of his life. If we remember rightly, Mr. Newman objected to the alleged perfection of Christ's character, on the ground that, if human, he *must* have had faults though none were discernible. Miss Hennell sees the reverse of moral greatness in his claim to be *the light of the world*, and charitably hopes that such expressions have been erroneously ascribed to him!

"The possibility of saying, *I am the Light of the world; no man cometh to the Father but by me*,—is one that may indeed be conceived as belonging to true divinity [why not rather to a true divine commission, we wonder]; but otherwise only to fanaticism of so utterly self-blinding a character, that it would condemn the character of Christ to a standard entirely below moral approbation, if we did not see how altogether more consistent it is with inherent probability to concur with the evidence afforded by criticism, that expressions of this ultra kind attributed to Christ were really never uttered by him."—P. 104.

Miss Hennell's own theory is, that "in the pure morality and devotional spirit of the Essenes, added to the ardent theocratic patriotism of the Gaulonite assertors of 'liberty in the Lord's name,' there is furnished a natural parent to all that was peculiar in the Christian doctrine of holiness." And she complains that this idea, first suggested, as she believes, in her late brother's *Inquiry concerning the Origin of Christianity*, "was scornfully rejected by those whose principles were of the same class as Mr. Martineau's." For ourselves, we confess we can no more see an ascetic Essene in Jesus, whose social and friendly habits invited the base insinuation of the Pharisees, than we can see the suggested likeness of his principles or conduct to that of "Judas the Galilean or Gaulonite, who persuaded the Galileans to resist an extraordinary taxation imposed by Cyrenius, the governor of Syria." (*Inquiry*, p. 6.) By Josephus's account, the adherents of Judas were Pharisees in doctrine, and held the notion "that God is to be their only Ruler and Lord," much like our fifth-monarchy men in later times,—on their swords' points. We do

not wonder that Christ's career should seem, to readers in general, to furnish a contrast rather than a parallel.

We have wished to speak courteously and kindly of the book which has challenged these remarks. We wish we could distinctly describe Miss Hennell's own theological position; but we confess her treatment of the subject of Christ and Christianity seems in some places (as in some already quoted) inconsistent with the womanly affection and reverence which in others she expresses. Still less does her Preface—which is intended to define her present position and explain some conscious modifications of former but recent views—assist us to understand her real whereabouts. She says, however (and let the reader take the distinction as he can), that in her recent book, called *Thoughts in aid of Faith*, “the result is one that appears to be best described, if description is necessary, as a Theistic Pantheism; while the result of the present Essay is, rather, a Pantheistic Theism.” Such shades of difference our weak philosophic vision, we confess, cannot distinguish, nor the propriety of the adjunct *theism* or *theistic* to the term Pantheistic or Pantheism. Miss Hennell, it will have been noticed, is not happy in her *style*, which greatly wants clearness and terseness. In the Preface this want is most of all manifest. We think we have misunderstood nothing—we have not knowingly misrepresented anything—in the book; but we are glad not to have occasion to deal critically with the Preface as an exposition of religious philosophy.

CAN ENGLAND PROTECT FUGITIVE SLAVES?

TEN years ago we denounced the contemptible meanness and heartless cruelty of the Northern United States, in consenting to the enactment of the Fugitive Slave Bill. We prided ourselves on our superior virtue, and thanked God that we had washed our hands of all complicity with slavery. When fugitives have narrated their escape from bondage, we have felt an honourable exultation as they described their intense joy on touching British soil and breathing the air which cannot enter the lungs of a slave. When the British abolitionist crosses from the States into Canada, he loves his own land with an affection he was scarce conscious of before, when he feels that he is no longer on the “slaveholders’ hunting-ground.” Within the last month we have been taught that our sincerity may be put to the test,—that we, like the Northern United States, may be entrapped by the ambiguous requirements of mutual engagements and the desire to preserve peace with powerful neighbours. The fugitives from slavery have hitherto dwelt securely in Canada.

They are not afraid to settle even on the frontier, within sight of the land of their oppressors. Sometimes, indeed, by craft or violence, they have been robbed of their liberty,—just as craft or violence might spoil their white neighbours of property or life; but over each equally was extended the protection of law.

For the first time within our knowledge, English law has been now made to serve the purposes of American lawlessness. The whole has been done in so specious a manner, that, had not public attention been stimulated and awakened, we should not have known that a slave was to be returned to his oppressors; we should only have been informed—if, indeed, the case of so obscure a man had reached us—that a murderer was being given up to a lawful tribunal in the United States. If the judgment in the case of Anderson is confirmed, we shall not indeed have Missourians claiming negroes from us as fugitives from service; but they will come, as professed ministers of justice, seeking fugitives from crime; and their victims will not be reduced merely to slavery, but will be made a terror to all who thought of copying their example, by the cruelest tortures which slaveholders can devise. No fugitive is safe. Those who have inflicted the greatest wrongs on negroes will not scruple at perjury. It will be as much a business to hunt negroes in Canada with perjurers, as to hunt them “down South” with blood-hounds. No trial before a Canadian jury is required. The slave-catcher has only to persuade a Canadian magistrate that the case is sufficiently strong to justify the trial of the accused before an American court, and the governor’s warrant will be obtained to hand over the defenceless man to that tribunal which has declared that the coloured man has “no rights which a white man is bound to respect.”

We extract a brief narrative of the case from the Toronto correspondence (Nov. 26, 1860) of the *New York Tribune*:

“On the 28th September, 1859 (1853), Seneca T. P. Diggs, of Howard co., Missouri, when returning home to dinner, saw walking across his plantation a strange negro, whom he hailed. In reply to a series of questions addressed to him by Diggs, the negro told a story to the following effect:

“He said his name was William Anderson, and that he was the slave of one Macdonald, who resided about thirty miles from Diggs’s plantation. To this Macdonald he had been sold in 1833 by a Mr. Perkins, whose estate was but a short distance from Mr. Diggs’s abode, and he was soon on his way thither for the purpose either of getting Perkins to buy him from Macdonald, or to exchange him for some other man. He had two reasons for desiring this; he had been much ill-treated by Macdonald, and he had a wife, slave to a man named Brown, whose estate adjoined that of Perkins. It is said that, according to the State law of Missouri, any negro found more than twenty miles from his master’s plantation without a pass may be arrested and taken back; the person so taking him back becoming entitled thereby to a reward of five dollars and a mileage of ten cents. After hearing Anderson’s account, Diggs

asked him for his pass. The poor fellow replied that he had none. 'Then,' said the humane slaveholder, 'I cannot allow you to go further till I hear from your master. Come with me, and I will give you some dinner.' The pair walked toward the house for some distance, when the negro broke and ran. Diggs immediately called out to three 'black boys' who were near, 'Catch that runaway, and I'll give you the reward.' Away the three started in pursuit. Anderson ran in a circle, and was chased for near an hour by them. Diggs after a while was joined by his son, a lad of fifteen (eight), and upon a signal from one of the black boys they crossed the circle, and met the runaway just as he was nearing a fence. Over this fence the planter leaped, brandishing in his hand a large stick. Anderson waved a large dirk-knife; before him stood the enraged planter, twenty yards behind him were hastening on his three pursuers, armed with stout clubs. There was not a moment to be lost. The planter commanded the breathless, panting negro to surrender; the negro said he would kill any one who touched him. Insolent language to fall from the lips of a slave! So thought the planter as he broke his stick over the fugitive's head. But the fugitive was as good as his word; he dealt a true blow, he plunged his knife into Mr. D.'s heart. It was now the planter's turn to fly; he endeavoured again to get over the fence, and was assisted in his attempt by Anderson, who stabbed him again and tumbled him into the ditch. In less than forty-eight hours there was an end to Mr. Diggs. He lived long enough to make a full confession, and then departed for a land where he will inevitably be convinced of certain facts concerning 'niggers' which he was fond of denying in his lifetime.

"Anderson succeeded in making good his escape to Canada, and took up his abode in the county of Brant. He lived a quiet and industrious life, and, being joined by his wife, felt himself truly a freeman. But some few months ago, the blood-hounds of the Missouri law found him out, and made a demand for his rendition under the Ashburton Treaty for the crime of murder. He was arrested and brought before the magistrates. The evidence adduced was in substance as I have given it above."

It seems that the magistrates, though they committed Anderson, thought it desirable to ask the opinion of the Attorney-General. After a delay of two months, he referred the case to the Judges; and Anderson was brought up to the Court of Queen's Bench by a writ of habeas corpus, and, in December last, three Judges read their respective decisions. Chief Justice Robinson, with whom Justice Burns concurred, refused the application for Anderson's discharge. After reviewing the facts of the case, he said:

"The point which has been argued before us, and the only point, is what construction and effect it is proper to give to those words in the Treaty and in our statute, 22 Vic. ch. viii. sec. 1 (Consolidated Statutes of Canada), which, when read together, in effect provide that a person charged with committing within any of the United States of America any of the offences mentioned in the Treaty,—that is to say, murder or assault with intent to commit murder, piracy, arson, robbery or forgery, 'and charged upon such evidence of criminality as, according to the law

of the place where the fugitive or person so charged shall be found, would justify his apprehension and commitment for trial, if the crime or offence had there been committed,'—may be apprehended upon complaint made under oath, in order that he may be brought before the judge or justice of the peace who has caused him to be apprehended, to the end that the evidence of his criminality may be heard and considered; 'and that if, on such hearing, the evidence be deemed sufficient by law to sustain the charge according to the laws of this province, he shall certify the same, together with a copy of all the testimony taken before him, to the governor of the province, in order that a warrant may issue upon the requisition of the proper authorities in the United States, or of any such States, for the surrender of the person charged, according to the stipulation of the Treaty.' It will be observed that in one part of the Treaty, as recited in the statute, the evidence of criminality is required to be such 'as would justify the apprehension of the party and his commitment for trial, if the offence had been committed in the country where he is found;' while in another part the evidence is required to 'be such as shall be deemed sufficient to sustain the charge.' Nothing can turn, I think, upon this variation of expression; but we must look upon the same thing as intended by both; for in the Treaty, as in the commencement of the statute, it is declared to have been agreed by the two powers that offenders charged with certain offences, flying from one country into the territories of the other, should be delivered up to justice—'provided, however, that this shall only be done upon such evidence of criminality as, according to the laws of the place where the fugitive so charged shall be found, would justify his apprehension and commitment for trial, if the crime had been there committed.' This shews that nothing more can be meant by the other form of expression than this, since, by the Treaty, evidence sufficient to commit the party for trial is all that is required to warrant his being given up."

The Chief Justice then examined the prisoner's plea—that it is necessary not only to have such proof of the killing as would be satisfactory to a Canadian tribunal, but also proof that the act committed would be murder according to Canadian law. It does not appear to us that he deals with this plea consistently. He allows that it might be reasonable to hold, to some extent, that the law of the two countries should be found to correspond:

"For example—if it were the law of Missouri that every intentional killing by a slave of his master, however sudden, should be held to be murder without regard to any circumstances of provocation or of any necessity of self-defence against mortal or cruel injury, I do not consider that a fugitive slave, who, according to the evidence, could not be found guilty of murder, without applying such a principle to the case, could legally be surrendered by the Treaty. But I could not go the length of holding, that because a man could not in the nature of the case be killed in this province while he was pursuing a slave—because there are not and by law cannot be any slaves here—therefore a slave who has fled from a slave State into this province cannot be given up to justice, because he murdered a man in that State who was at the time attempting to arrest him under the authority of law, in order to take him before a magistrate with a view to his being sent back to his master."

We have not seen the speech of Anderson's counsel; but Sir J. B. Robinson seems to us to misstate his plea. It is *not*—It is impossible in Canada that a slave should kill his pursuer, because there are no slaves here; and therefore we can accept no evidence that a slave killed his pursuer in Missouri. The plea is this—The killing of Diggs by Anderson is not in the circumstances a crime according to Canadian law, for he was acting in justifiable self-defence. This plea the Chief Justice would allow, if Anderson were defending himself “against mortal or cruel injury,” whatever might be the law of Missouri on the subject; but he does not allow it when Anderson was acting in defence of that liberty which is dearer than life, because the law of Missouri authorized Diggs to apprehend him. He declares it murder to kill Diggs, because he was acting under the authority of the law,—without any reference to the fact that such a law is absolutely opposed to our own; whilst it would *not* have been murder had Diggs, acting under the Missouri law, attempted to do Anderson mortal or cruel injury. But the two cases seem to us nearly identical. Diggs was doing him the “cruellest injury” in trying to rob him of freedom. He was armed with a stick: he had already struck Anderson, who might justly consider his life in danger. By Southern law, any negro who strikes a white person may be killed. If Anderson had returned Diggs’ blow, Diggs would have had, in Missouri, a legal right to murder him; and even if Anderson had attempted no resistance, Diggs could have killed him with impunity. Englishmen think that death is better than slavery; Southerners hold that a fugitive’s death is better than his liberty. According to his own showing, therefore, the Chief Justice should have released Anderson; but the person of Diggs seems to him inviolate, because he was an amateur constable, and might be only aiming to take Anderson before a magistrate: the intolerable injustice, worse than death to one of English feelings, which that magistrate would commit, is not a matter with which Sir J. B. Robinson cares to concern himself. He is consoled with the idea that the final decision does not rest with that court.

“If he shall be surrendered, and if he shall be tried for that offence (murder), it will be for the jury” (in the U.S.) “to dispose of the case under the direction of a Judge. There may then appear sufficient reasons to warrant the jury in taking a favourable view of the case, and to lead them to think it probable that the prisoner advanced towards the deceased and stabbed him under an apprehension that it was necessary, not merely to facilitate his own escape, but to save his life or to avert threatened violence at the moment. But the case, in my judgment, is not one in which the Justices at Brantford would have been warranted in assuming the functions of a jury, and intercepting a trial for the graver offence.”

We thought that a prisoner was to be held innocent till proved to be guilty. Here it seems that he is to have no benefit in

Canada from any doubt as to his criminality. Any favourable view of his case is to be left to a slaveholding jury acting under the direction of an American Judge! But the Chief Justice is not without his suspicions of the ultimate issue:

“We may be told that there is no assurance that the prisoner, being a slave, will be tried, fairly and without prejudice, in the foreign country; but no court or magistrate can refuse to give effect to an Act of Parliament by acting on such an assumption; nor can we be influenced by the consideration (a very painful one in all such cases) that the prisoner, even if he shall be wholly acquitted of the offence imputed to him, must still remain a slave in a foreign country.”

It is a refreshment to read the judgment of Mr. Justice M'Lean. He first shews that, irrespective of the question of slavery, the prisoner ought not to be given up. The history of the case, as he relates it, warns us what irregularities will be perpetrated, if the rendition of accused fugitives is left to the local magistrates. It seems that one Gunning, of Detroit, U.S., laid an information and complaint of murder against Anderson last April; but no evidence appears respecting any warrant issued. On the 28th of September, one Baker, paid by the county of Howard, Missouri, obtained a warrant; but this Baker had only hearsay evidence to adduce; and B. F. Diggs, son of the man who was killed, could not swear that Anderson was the man who killed him. Moreover, Anderson was not committed in the mode required when the prisoner awaits a surrender under the Treaty. For these reasons he held that the prisoner was entitled to be discharged from custody.

Though we might have been glad, for Anderson's sake, had he been discharged on these grounds, yet it is obvious that this would have afforded no security in subsequent cases. The true reasons why he should be discharged are given in the conclusion of the judgment:

“The law of England, or rather of the British Empire, not only does not recognize slavery within the dominions of the Crown, but imposes upon any British subject who shall have become the owner of slaves in a foreign State the severest penalties, and declares that all persons engaged in carrying on the slave-trade, when captured at sea, shall be liable to be treated as pirates. The prisoner Anderson, as appears by the statement of Baker, who came to this province to identify him, has felt the horrors of such treatment. He was brought up to manhood by one Moses Burton, and married a slave on a neighbouring property by whom he had one child. His master, for his own purposes, disregarding the relation which had been formed, sold and transferred him to a person at a distance, to whose will he was forced to submit. The laws of Missouri, enacted by their white oppressors, while they perpetuate slavery, confer no rights on the slaves, unless it be the bare protection of their lives. Can it, then, be a matter of surprise that the prisoner should endeavour to escape from so degrading a position; or rather would it not be a cause of surprise if the attempt were not made? Diggs, though

he could have had no other interest in it but that which binds slaveholders for their common interest to prevent the escape of their slaves, interfered to prevent the prisoner getting beyond the bounds of his bondage; and with his slaves pursued and hunted him with a spirit and determination which might well drive him to desperation; and when, at length, the prisoner appeared within reach of capture, he, with a stick in his hand, crossed over a fence and advanced to intercept and seize him. The prisoner was anxious to escape, and in order to do so made every effort to avoid his pursuers. Diggs, as their leader, on the contrary, was most anxious to overtake and come in contact with the prisoner, for the unholy purpose of riveting his chains more securely. Could it be expected from any man indulging the desire to be free which nature has implanted in his breast, that he should quietly submit to be returned to bondage and stripes if by any effort of his strength, or any means within his reach, he could emancipate himself? Such an expectation, it appears to me, would be most unreasonable; and I must say that, in my judgment, the prisoner was justified in using any necessary degree of force to prevent what to him must inevitably have proved a most fearful evil. He was committing no crime in endeavouring to escape and to better his own condition; and the fact of his being a slave cannot, in my humble judgment, make that a crime which would not be so if he were a white man. If, in this country, any number of persons were to pursue a coloured man with an avowed determination to return him into slavery, it cannot, I think, be doubted that the man pursued would be justified in using, in the same circumstances as the prisoner, the same means of relieving himself from so dreadful a result. Can, then, or must, the law of slavery in Missouri be recognized by us to such an extent as to make it murder in Missouri, while it is justifiable in this province to do precisely the same act? I confess that I feel it too repugnant to every sense of religion and every feeling of justice, to recognize a rule, designated as a law, passed by the strong for enslaving and tyrannizing over the weak—a law which would not be tolerated a moment if those who are reduced to the condition of slaves and deprived of all human rights were possessed of white instead of black or dark complexions. The Declaration of Independence of the present United States proclaimed to the world that all men are born equal and possessed of certain inalienable rights, amongst which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; but the first of these is the only one accorded to the unfortunate slaves; the others of these inalienable rights are denied, because the white population have found themselves strong enough to deprive the blacks of them. A love of liberty is inherent in the human breast, whatever may be the complexion of the skin. ‘Its taste is grateful, and ever will be so, till nature herself shall change;’ and in administering the laws of a British province, I never can feel bound to recognize as law any enactment which can convert into chattels a very large number of the human race. I think that on every ground the prisoner is entitled to be discharged.”

“There was a cheer and stamping of feet,” says the *Toronto Globe*, “when he concluded,—a rare occurrence in that court; but the occasion was a great one, and Judge M’Lean’s earnest words drew forth the deepest feelings of his hearers.”

After the unfavourable judgment of Judge Burns, the prisoner's counsel gave notice that it was his intention to move the case to the "Court of Error and Appeal." When all was over, the police were ordered to shoulder their muskets to prevent a rescue; and in a cab, guarded on each side by bristling bayonets, Anderson was taken back to the gaol. Lest the crowd should attempt violence, a company of Royal Canadian Rifles was under arms in the vicinity. On the following Wednesday (Dec. 19), a crowded meeting was held under the presidency of the Mayor, at which it was enthusiastically resolved to take steps to prevent Anderson being sent back into slavery. The right of appeal has been allowed, and if the higher court confirms the opinion of the Chief Justice, the case may yet be carried before the Privy Council at Westminster.

We are glad to find that the English press is alive to the importance of this decision. Even the *Times*, which is accustomed to listen to the pro-slavery sentiments of the commercial party in the States, feels that such tidings "is apt to make an Englishman's face flush, and to call forth an exclamation." "All human sympathies are tumultuously in favour of the slave, but it appears that human laws are as directly in favour of giving him up to the certain fate of being burnt alive." The *Times* justifies the majority in their declaration of the law, and continues as follows:

"But are we therefore to surrender this man to the cruel fate which awaits him in the neighbouring State? The suggestion is preposterous. That we who look with scorn upon the little state of Saxony for delivering up a Hungarian nobleman who had trusted to her hospitality, should, in our strength and our grandeur, deliver up a wretched slave who had run for our soil as to the ark of freedom, may be argued as a logical necessity, but is an obvious impossibility as a fact. How it will be, we do not pretend to foretell. How the logical necessity will be shewn to be a practical impossibility, we are by no means prepared to explain; but very confident we are that this negro is at this moment as safe in the prison of Toronto from ever being sent before a Missouri jury of slaveholders, as he would be if he were in the wilds of Central Africa. Meanwhile, as we gather from the report, there is no immediate hurry, or any danger of any steps being taken to carry out the judgment. From the decision of the Queen's Bench, there is, it appears, by the Canadian law, an appeal to the bench of Judges; and thence, again, there is an appeal, as we understand, to the Privy Council in England. Although we may fear that upon the broad question of law the decision of English lawyers must concur with that of the Queen's Bench of Canada, and although the ingenuity of counsel and of anxious judges may fail to discover any technical objection which may vitiate the proceedings, yet time will be afforded for the intervention of diplomacy, within the province of which a difficulty of this character specially falls. It is not because we have heedlessly gone into an engagement which involves an unsuspected obligation to burn an innocent man that we are therefore to burn him. It is not because we have blindly and unknowingly bound

ourselves systematically to outrage all the common laws of God and humanity that we are therefore now, as a matter of course, to do the first act and to take the first step by the same means as the Romans used to adopt when they desired to commit themselves to some nefarious enterprize—by the sacrifice of a slave.”

As we have the support of one out of the three Judges, we are not presumptuous in denying that there is any “logical necessity,” on “the broad question of law,” that Anderson should be given up. It is clear that the Treaty does not require rendition in the case of any act as to the criminality of which either nation has a peculiar opinion, but for crimes which all civilized nations acknowledge to be crimes. High treason is, in the eye of our law, as grave an offence as murder; but what is treason in one country may be admired and approved by its neighbours. Treason, therefore, is not mentioned in the Treaty. Nothing is more unpardonable in the eyes of a Southerner than an offence against “the peculiar institution;” but such offences are usually merits in the eyes of Englishmen, and the Treaty therefore ignores them. If the Treaty is to be interpreted by the public declarations of those who ratified it, we are confirmed in our views by the speech of Lord Aberdeen, June 30, 1843, in moving the Extradition of Offenders’ Bill in the House of Lords:

“He did not anticipate that any inconvenience could arise from the carrying out of this Treaty, except what referred to the case of fugitive slaves; and this was no doubt a subject that would require the utmost caution on the part of those who would have to administer the law, arising from the new relations between the two countries. Some supposed that a fugitive slave might be given up under this Treaty. This he must say was a most unfounded notion. Not only was a fugitive slave guilty of no crime in endeavouring to escape from a state of bondage, but he was entitled to the sympathy and encouragement of all those who were animated by Christian feelings. But then it had been said, a slave running away might be accused of theft, on the ground that the very clothes he wore were not his own, but the property of his master. This, however, in his (the Earl of Aberdeen’s) judgment, could never be construed into a theft. Nay, more; if a slave took a horse with him, or seized upon a boat, or, in short, appropriated to his use anything that was necessary to his flight, such an act could never be held to establish an *animus furandi*.”

If we remember aright, American lawyers have taken a corresponding view. An attempt was made to obtain the persons of deserters on the plea that they were thieves, having run off with their uniforms, the property of Her Majesty! The answer was, that they were not thieves, but deserters,—that as the taking the clothes they wore was a necessary part of the act of desertion, which was not specified in the Treaty, it could not be made a criminal offence.

The law thus expounded obviously applies to the case in point.

Murder and robbery are in the same category. If what would otherwise have been robbery becomes only an innocent appropriation of property when essential to the fugitive's escape, what would otherwise have been murder becomes only justifiable homicide when equally essential. If there is no felonious intent in the one case, neither can there be in another.

The point which seems to have impressed the Chief Justice is, that Diggs had a legal right to apprehend Anderson and take him before a magistrate. If we acknowledge this right, we must also acknowledge that Anderson was wrong in not yielding himself up without any further attempt to escape, however peaceful. If, however, he was right in ignoring the abominable law which made him a slave, he was equally right in ignoring the part of the same law which made Diggs a slave-catcher.

The Chief Justice states that he must not be influenced by the consideration that, as the prisoner will be deemed a slave in the United States, he may not receive a fair trial there, and if he is acquitted will still be detained as a slave. These considerations appear to us to confirm what we have already stated, viz. that Anderson's case is not one of those contemplated in the Treaty. That Treaty was made as with a civilized power, not as with barbarians. If it was the law of one of the Canadas that in all criminal cases in which a woman was concerned against a man, the testimony of no women could be received in her favour against that of a man, we are quite certain that the Americans would never have intended by a treaty to give up women who had fled to them for refuge, to be tried in a manner so obviously unjust: nor could we have intended to give up negroes, to be tried in a court where the testimony of negroes is not admitted against that of white persons. It is not requisite for the execution of the Treaty that punishments inflicted should be the same in each country; but it is requisite that they should be such as are utterly abhorrent and detestable to neither nation. As the punishments inflicted on slaves are of a horrid and savage nature—are exceptional punishments—the case of slaves must be regarded as exceptional to the Treaty. Moreover, it is essential to the execution of the Treaty, that Americans who are charged with offences in Canada should, if acquitted there, be allowed to return home, and that a similar safeguard should be ensured to English subjects. If, then, there are any British subjects who are exceptions to this rule, and who, if they were acquitted, would be kept from returning to the British dominions and would be reduced to slavery, which they dread like imprisonment or even death, they are excepted from extradition under a Treaty which was designed to promote the ends of justice.

Since we entirely ignore all laws relating to slavery, by pronouncing the fugitive free the moment he is within our dominions, whatever the legal obligations which held him in his native

land,—since we go further and actually make it an offence for a British subject to hold slaves, though in a land where slavery is allowed,—since care was taken in the Treaty to avoid violating the national conscience, by requiring that the evidence of criminality must be such as to justify the apprehension of the accused had the alleged offence been committed in Canada,—it appears as clear to us as to Judge M'Lean that Anderson has shewn no evidence of murderous intent which could justify his committal by a Canadian Judge.

We are disposed to go further. In this case Anderson acted like a hero and commands our sympathies; but there might be other cases in which fugitives may be charged with robberies, arsons and even murders, which were not committed in self-defence. We deny, however, that slaves are persons contemplated in the Treaty. We cannot recognize wrongs where there are no rights. A slave would not have the benefit of any treaty made by America with England; he ought not therefore to be the subject of any injury from it. If he is ignored in one case, he must be in the other. "Slaves," says South Carolina (Civil Code, art. 35*) "shall be deemed, sold, taken, reputed and adjudged in law, to be chattels personal in the hands of their owners and possessors, and their executors, administrators and assigns, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever." Chattels are not responsible agents. "Property has its duties as well as its rights;" but when a man is turned to property, he has no rights and therefore no duties. His conscience may tell him that he has duties; but then his conscience also tells him that he has rights. Judge Ruffin declared, "We cannot allow the right of the master to be brought into discussion in the courts of justice; . . . the power of the master must be absolute, to render the submission of the slave perfect."† "A king," when regarded as above law, "can do no wrong;" only his servants are responsible. A slave, as beneath law, can do no wrong; we deem his masters responsible. They make it a crime to give him full instruction as to right and wrong; they command him, when it suits their avarice or revenge, to commit adultery or to perpetrate cruel violence on his fellow-slaves; they daily set him an example of robbery—every day's extorted service is a renewal of the crime of man-stealing; and it is as absurd for a slaveholder to demand from us a slave, to punish him for the crimes committed in slavery, as it would be for a pirate to sue a victim who had escaped for his violent conduct on board his ship. We do not recommend slaves to commit those acts of vengeance which would make the lives of their masters intolerable; but this is because *we do not* hold slaves as chattels, but as men, many of them as fellow-christians. We wish them therefore to be better than we usually are our-

* Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin, chapter ii.

† Ibid.

selves—to “do good, hoping for nothing again”—to “recompense no man evil for evil.” At the same time, we repeat that we cannot, as Englishmen, regard chattels as under any legal obligation to the law which adjudges them such; nor can we recognize them as criminals for any offences with which they may be charged by their enemies, who hold them in compulsory bondage.

When the slave touches English soil, he is, for the first time, a man. He assumes all a man's duties and rights. He will be responsible for what he does as a man. But with regard to the past, there is an act of oblivion. We are no more concerned with what he has done as a chattel, than we are with the aberrations of a lunatic now recovered. We are not so much concerned: lunacy may return in spite of our care, but whilst the fugitive remains among us he can never be a chattel. It may be thought that, if we concede this, our dominions may be overrun with lawless and dangerous fugitives. Experience declares the contrary. There are about 60,000 persons of colour in Canada, mostly fugitives and their families. There are few perhaps of these fugitives against whom some charge of robbery might not be trumped up by their old owners; but they are not robbers now. Perfect adaptation to slavery is no proof of adaptation for freedom; outbreaks in slavery do not imply outbreaks in freedom. A few years ago, a “Commissioner” from the New York Tribune visited Canada to learn the condition of the fugitives. He was told that the gaol at Toronto was full of them: on inquiry he ascertained that there were only three persons of colour there; and whilst the coloured population at Toronto was 1500 or 1600, there were only 76 arrests among them, out of 5346 arrests, in the course of the year,—the amount of crime being twice as great among the whites in proportion to the population. The loyalty of the coloured race is unquestioned; none have a deeper interest in maintaining British dominion. We have been told that, in the last rebellion, peculiar confidence was reposed in the coloured troops for this reason.

If the majority of the Judges should be against us, what is to be done? Let us once more listen to Lord Aberdeen:

“Another point must be borne in mind, namely, that if at any time a fugitive slave should be demanded under this Treaty, the demand could not be made by any slave State, but by the central Government at Washington, and this would in itself be a considerable security against any improper application. Another security would be found in the reference which would be made to the Home Government by the governors of colonies in case of any difficulty arising, when the Home Government would of course be assisted by the best legal advice that could be obtained. But the great security was that, by an express stipulation in the Treaty, it was agreed that the article by which the two Governments bound themselves to a mutual surrender of criminals should continue in force only till one or other of the two Governments signified its intention to terminate it; so that whenever inconvenience arose, either Go-

vernment was at liberty to put an end to that part of the Treaty, without being under the necessity of giving any notice beforehand."

We find no security in the fact that the demand must be made from Washington, as long as Washington is a slave city and the Government there under slaveholding influence. This is one proof, among many, of the importance to ourselves that the United States Government should fully sympathize with our own on questions of human freedom. We cannot yet venture to predict what will be its character under the new Presidency. It is a provision of more importance that our own Government is likely to be consulted. The recent manifestation of public feeling is some guarantee against national dishonour. We have not that confidence which we desire in the Canadian magistracy. The conduct of Mr. Matthews, the committing magistrate, is reported to have been most disgraceful; he even put Anderson in irons. The fact that, in the frontier districts, coloured children are compelled to go to separate schools, proves that the vicious public sentiment of the United States is infectious. In Europe, however, the rights of the coloured race are respected; so far, at least, that the rendition of a fugitive would be an intolerable disgrace. We do not rely greatly on the "best legal advice." It was not legal advice, but the strong expression of public sentiment, that elicited from the hesitating Lord Mansfield the judgment which asserts the true honour of England. Our newspapers have done their duty; we must do ours. Through private representations to the Secretary for the Colonies, through memorials, and through our Representatives in Parliament, we must, should it prove necessary, make our convictions clearly felt. This case could scarcely have occurred at a fitter time. It will, we trust, enable our Minister at Washington to shew, in the present divided state of feeling in the States, that England sympathizes with those who consider the stability of a nation to consist not in slavery, but in freedom and justice. Should the last alternative be necessary, the termination of that part of the Treaty, we consider it a far less evil that our criminals should be suffered to live at large in the United States, and either reform or from renewed crime there fall within the grasp of the laws, than that our peaceful coloured fellow-subjects in Canada should have no security for their lives and freedom. But we venture to say that this step will not be necessary. When the law of South Carolina required the sheriff to seize coloured persons arriving in her ports even from British ships, imprison them, and in some cases sell them, our Government remonstrated, but were told at Washington that South Carolina could not be dictated to, and that if we insisted on it the Treaty must terminate. For the sake of peace, and thinking it the best way to attain the end in view, our Ministry humbled itself to wait South Carolina's pleasure, so far to alter the law that our seamen are safe so long as they keep in

their ships! We believe that the United States Government will be equally peaceable, equally willing that the Treaty should continue, if our Minister assures it that the right of sanctuary to the oppressed is as essential to us as the right to tyrannize can be to South Carolina; and that under no circumstances, and on no pretext whatever, will the people of England consent to deliver up those who have fled to them out of slavery.

R. L. C.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since writing the above, Mr. Chamerovzow, the Secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, has applied at the Court of Queen's Bench for a writ of *habeas corpus*, commanding the Governor of Canada and others to bring up the body of Anderson, on the ground of his illegal detention and the danger to his life. The Judges somewhat hesitated, lest they should be thought to interfere with colonial independence; but as there appeared to be no legal bar to their power, they felt that precedent required them to comply. In ordinary cases, we should feel jealous of anything that might look like intermeddling with the Canadian courts; but this case depends on the construction to be put upon a Treaty; and it is well that it should be tried where evidence is most accessible of the meaning of the framers of that Treaty. In addition to the speech of Lord Aberdeen which we have quoted, the Hon. G. Denman has drawn the attention of the *Times* to the statements of the Attorney-General at that time, of Lord Palmerston and Lord Macaulay, in the House of Commons, which entirely confirm Anderson's plea. Perhaps it would have been safer had the case of fugitives been directly referred to in the Treaty; but at that time the Fugitive Slave Bill had not been passed, and our Ministry might be excused if they deemed that, as regards the United States, *freedom* was *national*, in accordance with their Declaration of Independence, and slavery only a sectional and *peculiar* institution. If, instead of being a seceding State, South Carolina was now paramount at Washington, we might expect some difficulty from what is the only course left to British justice and honour; as South Carolinians have loudly complained of the loss of their "property" on British territory, and have even demanded that the President should interfere to prevent it!

NATURE AND GOD.

SIR,

IN reference to the remarks so thoughtfully and reverently expressed by your correspondent N. K. N. upon a position set forth in the article "Nature and God" in a late No. of the National Review, I would crave a little space in your valuable Magazine for the insertion of the following passage from the writings of that learned and pious Dutch theologian, Hugo Grotius. In his Prolegomena to the Treatise, "De Jure Belli ac

Pacis" (b. i. ch. i. sec. 10, § 5), that eminent author, when discussing the characteristics of the "*Jus Naturæ*," says, "This Law of Nature is so immutable, *that God Himself cannot change it*. For, though God's power is boundless, some things can be named to which it does not extend; inasmuch as, with regard to them, the assertion that they are liable to change, is without meaning and self-contradictory. *Just as God cannot hinder but that twice two must be four*, so neither can He render that otherwise than evil which is evil intrinsically."

And a little further on (sec. 11), the same writer adds, that "all this would be true, and the Law of Nature still be in force, even though it were supposed (as it could not be without the highest impiety), either that there were no God, or that He took no concern in things human."

These passages are, I apprehend, quite sufficient to shew that the doctrine criticised by your correspondent N. K. N. is not a dogma which the National Reviewer is either singular in holding or first in enunciating.

But without wishing to identify myself either with the position of N. K. N. (which, as I understand it, is, that God is by his very nature unconditioned, or, if conditioned at all, then purely *self-conditioned*), or with the view maintained by the National Reviewer and in the above passages of Grotius (viz. that the power of God does not extend to all things, or, in other words, that He is to some extent *conditioned ab extra*),—without, I say, wishing to take up absolutely either of these views, I would beg to call the attention of N. K. N. to a consequence of his views which to us as Unitarians is of far greater practical moment. For I conceive that the views of N. K. N., if strictly followed out, will prove fatal to the numerical argument so often triumphantly urged by Unitarian divines against the doctrine of the Trinity. If it be possible to doubt that (to use the words of N. K. N.) "ours (of the planet Earth) is the only geometry, the only scheme of pure physics that is true,"—if there be any escape from the conviction that (in essence, though not in mere form of expression) the "mathematics of star-gazers and seers of other habitats must demonstratively be the same with ours,"—then, I fear, we, as Unitarians, have no certain philosophical ground for denying the Trinitarian doctrine. If ours be not the one and only arithmetic, true the universe throughout,—if our system of calculation be not that to which even the Deity Himself is subject,—how can we rebut the assertion, in which in the last extremity the Trinitarian ever seeks refuge, that what is a mystery, a contradiction and an impossibility to man, may be possible and true to God? If, then, we cannot conceive of God Himself as having power to make a contradiction of this sort other than a contradiction,—if even His omnipotence cannot render an act *undone* which has once been done,—if this be so, may I not ask whether N. K. N. is not contending for a contradiction and an impossibility when he "deprecates any asseveration or insinuation that Almighty God *must*; that He is or *can be placed under conditions*"? If, then, even the power of the Supreme be under such limitations that He cannot make three the same as one, why should N. K. N.'s "reverence quiver" at the assertion of the mere philosophical position that the human mind cannot escape conceiving of the Supreme Deity as to a certain extent *conditioned*? I might have examined the remarks of N. K. N. more in detail, but I will content myself with simply offering these few observations to his notice.

J.

INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATION OF REV. EDWIN SMITH, M.A.

On Sunday evening, Jan. 6, an ordination service was held in Upper Brook-Street chapel, Manchester, on occasion of the Rev. Edwin Smith, M.A., entering on the duties of the Christian ministry as pastor of the congregation.

The chapel was crowded in every part, the interesting nature of the occasion having attracted many friends, not only from the sister congregations of Manchester, but from some of the neighbouring orthodox churches. The introductory devotional services were impressively conducted by Rev. John Gordon, of Dukinfield, who had kindly undertaken to supply the place of Rev. James Drummond, suddenly called away by the illness of a near relative. Mr. Eddowes Bowman, the chapel-warden, having next read the letter of invitation to Mr. Smith and that gentleman's reply, and added a few words of cordial welcome in the name of the congregation, Rev. Dr. Beard proceeded to offer to the new minister a welcome on behalf of the ministers and congregations of Manchester and its associated district. In a strain of affectionate earnestness, he alluded to the interest he had himself taken in guiding his early studies, and the pleasure he experienced at seeing the promise then put forth fulfilled by his continued success as a student at Manchester New College and more recently as a Hibbert Fellow. He reminded him of the high and ennobling nature of the office he had undertaken, and assured him of the sympathy and cordial assistance of himself and his brethren of the district in every case where their sympathy or counsel might be acceptable. Dr. Beard concluded by a graceful allusion to the respected and accomplished minister who had for so many years filled the pulpit to which his young friend had now been chosen, exhorting him to imitate his excellent and truly Christian qualities.

Rev. Edwin Smith replied. It was a source of peculiar pleasure to him to be welcomed on this occasion by one to whom he was indebted for so much assistance when, thirteen years ago, he began the course of study which had prepared him for the office he had now been called to undertake. The hand which had guided his first steps was now again stretched out to encourage him at the commencement of his more serious responsibilities. To many other friends, indeed, since that early period his obligations had been numerous and great; but to one they had been pecu-

liarily so; and he felt it most gratifying that, having been already welcomed by his earliest instructor, he was now to listen to the kind advice of him whom his hearers had known and loved for so many years as their faithful and revered pastor and friend. He had truly sympathized with the interest with which this morning they had listened to gospel truths uttered by that accustomed voice. When he looked back upon the privilege he had enjoyed in his own case, and saw himself welcomed among them as their settled minister, a successor of one so good and so respected as Mr. Tayler, he could not but say with the Israelites of old, "Hitherto hath the Lord helped me." Mr. Smith then alluded to the importance of the duties he would now have to discharge, the assumption of which he felt to be the most solemn epoch of his life. He would not attempt to dilate upon them or offer anything like a programme of his future labours, but would leave them to be developed by time and experience. If he might express in one word his idea of what he would wish his ministry to be, he would say that he should aim at making it a "ministration of the spirit." And he concluded by entreating his hearers, avoiding doubtful disputations, to unite with him, people with minister and minister with people, to shew forth that spiritual life which is the prosperity of the church.

Rev. J. J. Tayler next delivered the charge. He began by referring with much feeling to his own long and happy connection with the congregation. The thousand associations and mingled memories which rushed back upon him as he looked on the well-known walls, and even now recognized some familiar faces, and not less his personal regard for the young minister, inspired him with a more than ordinary interest in the solemn occasion of the evening. He then, from a comparison of the aspects of the church and the world as they are at present, and as they were when he himself, forty years ago, began his pastorate among the same people, drew some valuable lessons for guidance and warning. The prevalence of intellectual doubt and even disbelief, together with much spiritual earnestness,—the rapid advances of science and civilization and of material wealth and luxury,—made the office of a Christian minister more difficult now than it was, and demand higher acquirements united with high religious courage and fidelity. The minister's office

will be now to shew that the church has still a great part to play in the training and advancement of the race. He must know how to adjust the spiritual and material elements of our being, by bringing down religion among men and interfusing it into their hearts and homes. Strength equal to the difficulties of this task must be sought and will be found in the spirit of Christ, and in that alone.

"Cultivate then," continued the speaker, "above all things, the religious life in yourself and in others. The spirit of religion is not to be sought for in the learning or the controversies of theology, but nestles silent and unseen amidst the realities of our daily experience. Religion is not so much a truth to be proved as a necessity inherent in our souls. Never separate yourself from human life, but make the human soul, with its weakness and its strength, the subject of your earnest study. As one means of building up the religious life of your people, maintain among them a devout and intelligent observance of those two most needful and beautiful ordinances of the Christian church, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Connect with this part of your pastoral duties the systematic instruction of the young in the first principles of religion. I need not commend to your special attention the schools and missionary institutions which bear so honourable a testimony to the zeal and earnestness of this neighbourhood, for you early shewed interest and ability in this department of a Christian pastor's work. I would only say, strive through these avenues to gain access to the mind and heart of the great unreclaimed masses of your fellow-creatures, and make them sharers with their more favoured brethren in those spiritual blessings which are to them at present an unreality."

Referring to the subject of a minister's studies, Mr. Tayler expressed his decided opinion that though the best foundation for Christian study is to be found in the experiences of the religious life, no man can conscientiously discharge the duties of a Christian teacher in these times without close and laborious reading. Congregations that understand this should be considerate in their demands on the time of a young man, who cannot spiritually nourish them if he is compelled to starve himself. By study is not meant mere reading, but reading combined with thought and meditation in the systematic acquirement of knowledge. Not that a minister should attempt to know everything; this in the present state of science is impossible. Let one field be chosen and thoroughly cultivated; social, moral and spiritual questions hav-

ing of course the first claim, as bearing on the special vocation of the minister. "If you cannot do more in the first instance, at least make yourself acquainted with the ascertained results in those branches which belong to your office, and never shrink from the honest encounter of an established truth."

Controversy, continued Mr. Tayler, though perhaps little in harmony with the spirit of Christianity, cannot be always avoided; it is sometimes an obvious duty to engage in it. When the necessity arises, it should not be a mere war of texts, but based upon a clear, comprehensive knowledge of the conditions, critical, historical and philosophical, on which the controversy ultimately rests.

After some admirable remarks on the subject of literature, in which he recommended the study of the great writers of the past of every age, as more ennobling than that exclusive dependence on modern authors which is too prevalent among us, Mr. Tayler concluded with an earnest exhortation to his young friend to be faithful in the great work this day committed to him. "All is contained in that one word, *'fidelity.'*" When you and I are summoned in our respective seasons to our last account, may it be our highest reward to find that we have neither of us lived and spoken altogether in vain, and to recognize among the millions of the redeemed some whom our words had rescued from sin and guided into the peaceful ways of righteousness and eternal life!"

The services of the evening were concluded by an eminently practical and useful sermon by Rev. William Gaskell, from Philippians i. 27, last clause, "Stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel." His subject was, the duties of congregations; and he considered them under three heads: as arising from their relation to their minister, to each other, to the outer world. He reminded them of the powerful influence they could and did exert upon their minister for good or for evil, encouragement or discouragement. They should not indulge in a critical, fault-finding spirit, but endeavour to gather from his instructions all that could be made applicable to themselves. Let them not expect to agree with everything he may say; in a denomination which boasts of its freedom, absolute agreement must not be expected or desired. Let them encourage their minister by a faithful attendance on his ministrations and by co-operation in good works, which they had in their letter of invitation recognized as their duty, and which would do more than anything to unite the minister

and the people, and foster the life of the church. Let each take his share in this work, not shrinking from it on the pleas of being too old or too young or too poor to be of use. Those that were too old to work, were the more able to advise; those too young to advise, were the more vigorous for labour; those that were too busy for personally joining in philanthropic efforts, might contribute of the fruits of their business; and those who were too poor for this, might apply the contributions of the rest. Lastly, let them all remember that though we are everywhere spoken against, and men refuse even to hear our defence or read our arguments and our writings, they will and do note our conduct and read our lives; by our life and conduct, therefore, let us see to it that we do no discredit to the simple faith which we profess.

Rev. Edwin Smith is the son of the late Rev. J. C. Smith, of Thorne, Yorkshire. Having passed with eminent success through the six years' course of Manchester New College, he took a Hibbert Scholarship, and subsequently the higher grade of a Fellowship under the same Trust. And in taking the M.A. degree of the London University in the department of Classics, he has received the highest testimony to his ability and acquirements as a scholar.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

The annual meeting of the Trustees was held at Cross-Street chapel rooms, Manchester, on the 16th of January. The chair, in the absence of the President, was taken by Mr. Thomas Ashton, the Treasurer. There were present Mr. Mark Philips, Mr. W. R. Wood, Rev. William Gaskell, Rev. John Colston, Rev. T. E. Poynting, Rev. C. Beard, Rev. F. Baker, Rev. S. A. Steinthal, Rev. Henry Green, Rev. J. Gordon, Rev. R. C. Jones (Bristol), Rev. John Robberds, Mr. W. Shaen, Mr. S. Robinson, Mr. R. D. Darbishire, Mr. R. Worthington, Mr. James Worthington, Mr. John Booth, Mr. R. Shipman, Mr. Holbrook Gaskell, Mr. G. Wadsworth and Mr. E. Bowman.

The minutes of the proceedings of the Committee during the past year having been read by Mr. R. D. Darbishire, one of the Secretaries, and their confirmation moved and carried, the Treasurer's report of the finances was read, shewing that the total receipts of the year were £2480. 18s. 3d., and the total expenditure, £2432. 0s. 9d., leaving an excess of receipts over expenditure of £48. 17s. 6d.

To a question by Mr. Wood concerning the benefaction of £121 from the Rev.

R. W. Simpson, it was replied that no special reasons had been given or object prescribed by the donor.

Rev. Charles Beard then read the following address of the Committee :

"The Committee of Manchester New College, in presenting their annual report, desire, in the first place, to congratulate the Trustees on the unprecedentedly large number of students who are availing themselves of the advantages offered by the Institution. Although four gentlemen left the College at the close of the session 1859-60, either to pursue their studies as Hibbert Scholars or to take charge of congregations, their places have been more than supplied by six others, who, with two lay students, raise the total number of regular attendants upon the classes to twenty. The completeness of the course through which the divinity students are conducted, the unremitting zeal and great efficiency of the Professors, and the industry and good feeling which characterize the students, have, during the past year, been repeatedly brought under the notice of your Committee, who, in retiring from office, have the pleasure of transferring to their successors the charge of a prosperous and useful Institution.

"The propriety of realizing the increased value of the site of the College-buildings in Mosley Street, Manchester, has frequently, in former years, been the subject of discussion amongst the officers of the College. Since the last annual meeting, circumstances connected with the state of trade have induced your Committee to make careful inquiry into the present value of this property, and the result has been an offer which they have deemed it their duty to accept. The terms of sale will, on the 24th June, 1861, place in the hands of the Committee the sum of £14,025, £6000 of which will be represented by a perpetual chief rent of £300 a-year, chargeable upon the land and the buildings to be erected thereupon. When the remaining £8025 is invested as part of the Permanent Fund, the College will have exchanged a variable income, involving a continual outlay, for one considerably greater in amount and subject to little change or deduction.

"The Committee have been apprized of considerable testamentary benefactions by the late Mr. Thomas Hanson, of Birkenhead, and also by his widow; but as the estates have not yet been realized, the amount of the residuary bequests to the College is at present unascertained.

"The Committee have great pleasure in reporting the receipt of valuable donations of books to the College library, from the Rev. R. B. Aspland and Mr. Mark Philips,

as the representatives of the subscribers to the Wellbeloved testimonial; and from Mr. C. E. Mudie, who has now, for the third time, enriched the library by a liberal contribution of recently published works, the selection of which he has kindly entrusted to the Curator. The rapid increase of the library has not only necessitated some outlay in providing additional book-cases, but an entire re-arrangement of the books and catalogues. During the progress of this work, which is already in the hands of the Curator and his assistants, the opportunity will be taken of setting aside duplicate or superfluous volumes, with a view to their exclusion, under the direction of the Committee.

"The Committee have to lament the death, since the presentation of the last annual report, of Mr. T. W. Tottie, of Leeds, who, from 1846 to 1848, filled the office of President; of the Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, of Nottingham, since 1823 a Trustee of the College; and of the Rev. Joseph Hutton, LL.D., who at the time of his death was one of your Vice-Presidents. Dr. Hutton's long connection with the College, as Student, Visitor and Vice-President, his warm and unvarying interest in its prosperity, and the honour which was reflected upon it by the Christian simplicity and purity of his character, demand a special word of commemoration.

"The Committee have learned with regret that, although the duty had for some time been lessened by the relinquishment of the evening service, the Principal has been compelled by ill health to resign his part in the joint ministry of Little Portland-Street chapel. It is, at the same time, a matter for congratulation that Mr. Tayler is so far recovered from his illness as to be able to discharge his important duties to the College with unabated zeal and success. Mr. Martineau, with the cordial assent of the Committee, has accepted an invitation to undertake the sole ministerial charge of the congregation.

"During the session 1859-60, the number of divinity students on the foundation was fifteen, viz., sixth year, Messrs. Joseph Dare, B.A., Percy Bakewell, B.A., George Heaviside, B.A., R. W. Simpson, B.A.; fifth year, Mr. Frederick Mitchell; fourth year, Messrs. E. S. Howse, B.A., J. D. H. Smyth, Alexander Gordon, B.A.; third year, Messrs. H. E. Dowson, W. J. Smyth; second year, Mr. T. H. Smith; first year, Messrs. J. E. Odgers, R. Pilcher, J. K. Smith. Besides these, Mr. Pillars, fourth year, was absent during the greater part of the session on account of ill health; Mr. W. C. Coupland, B.A., fifth year, was admitted free to lectures.

"Mr. Joseph Dare, Mr. Percy Bakewell, Mr. Geo. Heaviside and Mr. R. W. Simpson, have completed their academical course. Mr. Dare is pursuing his studies as a Hibbert Scholar; Mr. Bakewell has accepted the charge of the congregation at Northampton, and more recently of that at Warwick; Mr. Heaviside has succeeded the Rev. Thomas Hunter at Coventry; Mr. Simpson, who had made a temporary settlement at Horsham, has since announced his intention of retiring for the present from the public duties of the ministry. The Rev. Edwin Smith, M.A., who left the College in 1856, and has since been studying as a Hibbert Scholar and Fellow, has succeeded the Rev. J. H. Hutton, B.A., in the ministry at Upper Brook-Street chapel, Manchester.

"The annual examination was held in University Hall on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, June the 25th, 26th and 27th. At the close of the proceedings, the Rev. William Gaskell, M.A., Visitor, delivered to the students the usual Address, which has since been printed by the Committee and circulated amongst present and former students of the College.

"The Committee make the following extract from the Visitors' report of the examination:

"The serious illness of the Principal unfortunately prevented us from having the benefit of his assistance, and although Professor Martineau kindly undertook to examine his classes for him, they necessarily suffered in some degree from his absence. We had reason also to regret that two of the students who had been most faithful to their duties had been obliged to return home on account of the state of their health, and another in consequence of sad family bereavement. Notwithstanding these drawbacks, we have pleasure in being able to report that, on the whole, the examination was satisfactory, and shewed that the students generally were animated by the right spirit, and were diligently working with the Professors in their earnest endeavours to maintain the character of the Institution for accurate scholarship and sound theological knowledge."

"In the examinations of the University of London, Mr. H. E. Dowson and Mr. Pillars have obtained the degree of B.A., the former with honours in Classics. Mr. Edwin Odgers and Mr. Richard Pilcher have matriculated. Mr. C. B. Upton, B.A., formerly a student of the College, and now a Hibbert Scholar, and Mr. W. C. Coupland, B.A., have passed the voluntary examination in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the Greek text of the New Testament, the Evidences of the Christian

Religion and Scripture History, Mr. Upton gaining a prize of books, value £5. Mr. E. S. Howse, B.A., and Mr. Alexander Gordon, B.A., have been elected Hibbert Scholars.

"In the classes of University College, the following distinctions have been gained by students of Manchester New College: senior Greek—Mr. H. E. Dowson (third year), first prize; junior Greek—Mr. Odgers (first year), fourth certificate; Mr. Pilcher (first year), sixth certificate; junior Latin—Mr. Odgers (first year), first prize; Mr. Pilcher (first year), fourth certificate; lower junior Mathematics—Mr. Pilcher (first year), prize.

"The session of 1860-61 opened with the following students: divinity students on the foundation—Messrs. Frederick Mitchell, E. T. Howse, B.A., J. D. H. Smyth, Alexander Gordon, B.A., H. E. Dowson, B.A., W. J. Smyth, James Pillars, B.A., T. H. Smith, J. E. Odgers, Richard Pilcher, J. K. Smith; free to lectures, Mr. W. C. Coupland, B.A. The new divinity students of the year are—on the foundation, Messrs. H. M. Dare, A. N. Blatchford, R. A. Armstrong, A. Payne; free to lectures, Messrs. J. E. Carpenter, Domokos Simén; lay students, Messrs. David Ainsworth, John Ainsworth. Besides these, Mr. Upton and Mr. Dare, Hibbert Scholars, have been admitted free to particular courses of lectures. Five other gentlemen, on paying the usual fees, are also in attendance as occasional students.

"The Committee desire to draw the special attention of the Trustees to the name of Mr. Domokos Simén, a student sent to this country by the Unitarian church of Transylvania, to whom they have willingly granted free admission to lectures. They have been glad thus to do their part in knitting the bonds of goodwill with a church which has borne long and faithful testimony to the principle which it is the object of Manchester New College to uphold and disseminate.

"In compliance with a request repeatedly urged upon them, the Committee have printed in a connected form, for private circulation, the questions put to the students at the last annual examination. To these papers, which, more accurately than any prospectus of lectures, exhibit the course of studies actually pursued in the College, the Committee appeal in proof that the Institution is efficiently performing its work of giving a theological education, which, while in itself complete and scientific, is based upon the careful discipline of all the intellectual powers, and is directed to the maintenance of a succession of ministers animated by a single-minded

devotion to the cause of religious truth. It cannot be necessary to convince those who have so long extended a zealous and liberal support to Manchester New College, of the advisability of educating and maintaining in our churches a learned ministry; or to prove that a careful intellectual preparation for the sacred office cannot tend to quench the flame of genuine piety, or to damp the ardour of true missionary zeal. A large acquaintance with the great principles of religion is the best guarantee for the performance of the simplest ministerial duty; and the meanest Christian labour to which the student may hereafter be called, affords opportunity for the exercise of the amplest and best-disciplined faculties. But at the present moment, when theological investigation in other churches is directed by a freer spirit and is assuming a more scientific form, it appears to your Committee to be of the first importance that Manchester New College, and the studies to which it is devoted, should receive from its friends the heartiest sympathy and the most liberal support. For while it offers to its students facilities of theological instruction and inquiry unequalled in any other English academical institution, it stands alone in the free, scientific, yet reverent spirit in which it investigates and maintains the claims of Christian truth. If for seventy-five years its teachers and students have led the way in the cultivation of English theology, it is doubly important that now, when a movement, necessarily shackled by ecclesiastical and doctrinal restrictions, is making itself felt by all thoughtful men, it should not, from any want of sympathy on the part of those whose principles and desires it embodies, fall back from its place in the van of theological progress, and fail to impress upon the religious thought of future years the faithful and fearless honesty by which its modest usefulness has been so long illustrated and justified. At a moment when, if ever, your Committee are warranted in hoping that the labour of more than one generation of their predecessors is about to bear an abundant and unexpected harvest, they confidently commit the College, and the great principles which it represents, to the zeal of the churches for which it endeavours to train faithful and efficient ministers, and to the blessing of Almighty God."

The adoption of the report having been moved and seconded by Rev. H. Green and Rev. J. Gordon,

Mr. W. R. Wood said that there were many things both in the report now read and in the proceedings of that morning, which he had heard with satisfaction; and

it was not his intention to oppose in any way the passing of the resolution. He attended the meeting because he desired by so doing to obtain information as to the state and position of the College, and also to declare his unchanged attachment—an attachment which would, he trusted, never depart from him whilst he lived—to the principles which the College had long maintained. But his attendance at the meeting, or his assenting to the adoption of the report, must not be understood as conveying the withdrawal of any opinion he had formerly expressed, or as implying that the present arrangements for instruction in the College had his confidence or approval.

The resolution was then put and carried unanimously.

The usual business resolutions followed. Mr. Thomas Ainsworth was re-elected President; Mr. Thomas Ashton, Treasurer; Rev. W. Gaskell, Chairman of Committee; Rev. C. Beard and Mr. R. D. Darbishire, Secretaries, &c. &c.

The business of the meeting closed with a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

ST. SAVIOURGATE CHAPEL, YORK.

This building, the oldest place of Non-conformist worship in York, has recently undergone considerable repairs and alterations. Its rather singular form—that of a Greek cross, with a massive square tower over the centre—will be very familiar to some of our readers, former students of Manchester College, York. Externally the building remains much as it was; except only that, about twelve years ago, the wall which separated the chapel-ground from St. Saviourgate was replaced by a lofty iron railing. The recent changes have been chiefly internal.

In the old arrangements of the interior, the pulpit stood against the wall, at the left-hand corner of what may be termed the transept and chancel; the space for the communion service was at the farther end of the latter; and the rest of the chapel was occupied with the old-fashioned and, in some cases, large and high-backed pews. The whole of the former pewing, which was in parts much decayed, has been removed, new flooring being laid down throughout. In fact, the whole interior of the chapel has been renewed, excepting only the pulpit and a portion of the gallery floor. On removing the old plaster, it was found, from the number of what bricklayers call “soft bricks,” that it would be desirable to *stoothe* the walls before replastering. This operation, which is expected to promote the warmth and dryness

of the interior, has had the effect of slightly recessing the monuments, which are numerous and many of them handsome. They now appear as if set in the wall, surrounded with a kind of beading or framing, and the general effect is excellent. The oak pulpit has been restored nearly to its original colour by the removal of the almost black coat of staining and varnish, the growth, probably, of more than a century and three-quarters. It has been fixed upon a new base and placed at the chancel corner, opposite to that at which it before stood, but some feet in advance of the wall and without the old sounding-board. A new and handsome reading-desk, also of oak, stands at the opposite angle, nearly on the spot occupied by the former reading-desk. Between the two, and in advance of them, is the space for the communion-table, divided from the rest of the chapel by a low step and a substantial balustrade, all of oak. This is approached directly in front by the aisle, leading up from the centre entrance; on each side of which, as well as right and left within the transept, the pews have been disposed much as they were before. These are of red deal, stained and varnished, the seat ends being massive and deeply carved. They are without doors, except three on each side near the smaller entrances.

By the removal of the organ from the gallery over the main entrance, some additional room has been here gained for sittings; the former gallery-front having been replaced with a new one in keeping with the rest of the wood-work. The organ now stands in the chancel, some distance behind the line of the pulpit and reading-desk, the space for the choir being immediately before the organ. The effect of this arrangement is in some measure to screen off a portion of the chancel sufficient for a class-room for Sunday-scholars—a part of the chapel which, lying almost behind the pulpit, has hitherto been comparatively little used.

The gas-lighting is provided for by brackets fixed upon the wall. These are of brass, cast from an antique pattern, supplied by the architect, Mr. G. Fowler Jones, of York. The vestry has been considerably enlarged, as well as the vestibule at the main entrance; and the whole of the seats have been cushioned and matted in a uniform manner.

The chapel was re-opened for public worship on the 30th of December last.

CLOVER STREET, ROCHDALE.

The annual tea-meeting of the members of the Unitarian congregation assembling

in Clover-Street chapel, Rochdale, was held in the school-room on Tuesday evening, January 8, 1861. About two hundred friends sat down to tea. After tea, the Rev. S. F. Macdonald, the minister of the sister congregation, Blackwater Street, took the chair. On the platform were the Revds. James C. Street, Charles C. Nutter and E. W. Hopkinson, from Manchester; Messrs. W. Mitchell and J. Briggs, of the Home Missionary Board; Mr. Henry Hill and Mr. E. Clegg, of Rochdale. The members of the choir of the Blackwater-Street chapel were present, and added greatly to the success of the meeting by their excellent singing.

The CHAIRMAN opened the proceedings by offering the hearty compliments of the season to all who were present. He had a varied bill of fare to offer to them, and was sure that they would have an interesting and profitable meeting. He expressed his great interest in all matters which affected the welfare of the Clover-Street congregation, and said how glad he was to render them any aid in their works of usefulness and piety. He urged upon them renewed efforts during the year which had just opened before them.

After a glee had been sung, the Rev. JAMES C. STREET was called upon to respond to the first sentiment, "Civil and Religious Liberty all the World over." In a long and earnest speech he referred to the different circumstances under which that sentiment had been uttered,—the marvellous times in which we lived, when the greatest events were being transacted before our eyes, giants of thought and heroism and action moving among the people, developing lofty principles and prompting to glorious deeds. He then rapidly referred to the recent acts of the French Emperor in breaking down the passport system and in opening the ports of France to a free commerce with England,—to the mighty revolution which was silently proceeding in the empire of Russia, whose millions of serfs would soon become free men,—to the determined movement of the Hungarian people, who were enforcing their claims and winning their rights from the hands of a tyrannical ruler,—to the struggle taking place in America in consequence of the triumph of the men of freedom, who had elected a President whose principles and policy were adverse to slavery,—and to the glorious struggle in Italy, where the descendants of a noble race, under the banner of the hero of the age, had risen in majesty and swept away the cruel dynasties of kings who had trampled upon human rights and liberties and earned an immortality of infamy.

Paying honour to Garibaldi and Mazzini, Mr. Street went on to point out the hopeful prospects of civil liberty all the world over. He then declared that civil and religious liberty were twin sisters and inseparable, that as the one advanced so also would the other. He referred to the struggles of the Transylvanian Unitarians,—to the advance of liberal principles generally,—to the different auspices under which Unitarians could now assemble in England, the freedom from civil disabilities, and their liberty to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. He gave a passing glance at the period when Unitarianism was treated as a crime, its friends hunted and oppressed, and its adherents scouted and condemned,—and contrasted the present day, when we were making our way among our fellow-men and winning the people to our lofty standard. From the whole subject, Mr. S. drew the conclusion that the banner of civil and religious liberty never stood so high, and declared that if its friends were united and faithful it would soon float in triumph above every citadel of slavery and oppression.

Mr. HENRY HILL spoke in support of the same sentiment.

Rev. C. C. NUTTER then responded to the sentiment, "Unitarian Christianity in harmony with the Teachings of Science and the most advanced Knowledge of the Age." In a clear and simple manner he referred to the great scientific discoveries of recent times, and shewed how completely they were at war with the ordinary teachings of theology. He pointed out how the sciences of astronomy, geology and physiology, demolished the fabric which superstition and ecclesiasticism had erected, and then went on to indicate the harmony there was between the highest results of science and the liberal principles of Unitarian Christianity. He narrated several anecdotes connected with his own religious history, illustrating the bondage of creeds and the glorious freedom he had obtained in being united with Unitarians. He did not know what an orthodox minister could do with the sentiment to which he was speaking; it would be impossible that he could honestly speak to it; but Unitarians welcomed with open arms every successive revelation of truth, and knew that their own religious principles were so broad and liberal that they had nothing to fear in the advance of knowledge and the results of science. He pressed the sentiment upon the attention of his auditors.

Mr. W. MITCHELL, of the Home Missionary Board, then spoke upon "A simple

and rational Faith the cure for Scepticism.” He adverted to his own experience, and shewed how the rigours of a Calvinistic theology had driven him into the ranks of Secularism, and how he had been rescued therefrom by the simple and rational teachings of Unitarian Christianity. He said that a faith such as this would do much in rescuing many from the cold and dreary region of scepticism, if made known with affectionate earnestness and zeal.

Rev. E. W. HOPKINSON then commended Unitarianism as the source of a practical religious life. He dwelt upon the necessity of taking our religion into our hearts and homes, and shewed how beautifully it would influence our lives. He said that religion was manifested not in creeds, nor in regular attendance upon public worship, nor in a reverent attitude, but in a holy life. Unitarian Christianity was eminently calculated to benefit mankind, and if only preached with the eloquence of a true life, it would win its way and produce beneficent results. He concluded by expressing his high gratification in being present at so good a meeting, and declared his willingness to render any aid he could to further the interests of the congregation.

Mr. T. BRIGGS, of the Home Missionary Board, and Mr. PHILIPS, of Rochdale, effectively urged the next sentiment—“The Christian Congregation, what it is and what it ought to be.” The Chairman also added some excellent observations concerning the duties of a congregation.

Mr. JOHN HEATON, who had been a teacher in the Sunday-school for upwards of twenty years, next addressed the meeting. He was sorry he could not give so good an account as usual either of the attendance of teachers or scholars. They had not been so prosperous as they ought to have been during the last year, but he trusted they would all bestir themselves and take care to do better in the future. It seemed to him that they could not hope to succeed unless they had a settled minister; he trusted they would be able to have one soon.

Rev. J. C. STREET was called upon to speak in reference to the Sunday-school. He said that a Christian congregation had two phases of duty—work and worship; that these could not be severed. It was impossible that the spirit of Christ could be among them unless they applied themselves to a work like Christ’s. He urged with great impressiveness the duty of taking care of the Sunday-school, and trusted that they would apply themselves with a tenfold zeal during the present year. He appealed to young and old to put their hands to the plough, reminding them of

the self-denying and successful labours of their forefathers, and urged them by the memories of the past and the hopes for the future to leave no stone unturned, no efforts untried, to bring back their school and congregation to its former success.

After several pieces had been sung and several votes of thanks awarded, the hearty and enthusiastic thanks of the meeting were accorded to the Rev. S. F. Macdonald for his conduct in the chair, his services to liberal Christianity, and his zealous labours on behalf of the Clover-Street congregation. Mr. Macdonald suitably responded, and the interesting meeting concluded with a hymn.

CONFERENCE OF SUNDAY-SCHOOL DIRECTORS.

On Saturday evening, Jan. 12th, a conference of Sunday-school directors and teachers was held in the Lower Mosley-Street school-room, Manchester, to consider the subject of “Systematic religious instruction in Sunday-schools, its importance and method.” About fifty persons sat down to tea. After tea, John Booth, Esq., the President of the District Sunday-School Association, was called to the chair. He called upon the Rev. Joseph Freeston to read the paper he had prepared upon the subject they had met to consider. Mr. Freeston read a carefully written essay, urging the necessity of adopting more systematic plans of teaching, suggesting that a regular course of lessons should be drawn up for the year and regularly published in the Penny Magazine, and gave some practical illustrations of the methods to be adopted. He thought that such a plan would tend to make our schools more useful and our instruction more valuable.—Rev. T. E. Poynting concurred to a great extent in the views of the essayist, but was hardly prepared to enter into the consideration of the details given. He gave an interesting account of the plans adopted in the excellent and well-conducted schools at Monton.—Rev. J. C. Street could not concur in the proposed plans. There were practical difficulties in the way. To give systematic teaching, you must have trained teachers. Now it was well known that our teachers were drawn from all ranks of the people, and who possessed most diverse qualifications. No arbitrary system would meet their wants. Educated teachers pursued plans of their own which experience had shewn were successful, and uneducated teachers would be unable to adopt the plans proposed. In the present state of education it was impossible to adopt any systematic instruction which would be common to all our schools; each must to a large extent

be left to its own methods. It was a thing to excite surprise and admiration that, considering the way in which most of our teachers had to labour day by day, they were able to do their work in the Sunday-school so efficiently as they were. It would be injudicious to interfere with their present usefulness. When the standard of culture was more generally exalted, the plan proposed might meet with more acceptance.—Mr. J. Worthington thought Mr. Freeston had overlooked the necessity of the religious life in the teachers.—Mr. John Taylor and Mr. Smith approved of the suggestions offered.—Dr. Marcus felt the same difficulties which had struck Mr. Street, and he argued long against the essay.—Rev. C. C. Nutter gave some account of his experience of the schools in the neighbourhood, and pointed out some of the disadvantages under which they appeared to labour. He suggested the formation of classes among the teachers to prepare themselves for their Sunday duties, and made some practical remarks concerning order and discipline.—Messrs. Harrison, Simpson, Cope and Walwork, also took part in the discussion; and afterwards Mr. Freeston replied to the various objections which had been urged, and again contended for the scheme he had proposed. No resolution was adopted. On the motion of Rev. J. C. Street, a vote of thanks was warmly accorded to Mr. Booth for his conduct in the chair, and the meeting closed about nine o'clock.

NORTHAMPTON.

A social tea-meeting of the members of the Unitarian congregation and their friends in this town took place on Tuesday evening, January 8. The meeting was an interesting and a successful one, the only exception to its perfect success being attributable to the circumstance that the rooms which were occupied for the purpose were quite insufficient to accommodate with ease the company assembled on the occasion, so much more numerous than had been expected. This difficulty, however, did not disturb the harmony of the meeting, but was rather the source of much of the good feeling which prevailed throughout.—After the repast, the chair was occupied by William Dennis, Esq., who opened the proceedings with a speech containing much earnest sentiment.—The meeting was then successively addressed by the Rev. J. K. Montgomery, M.A., of Chester, who in stirring language exhorted his hearers to persevere in their great mission, that of bearing testimony to the value of their pure and simple theology in

its power to elevate the whole moral nature of man, and at the same time to satisfy the highest aspirations of his soul after spiritual growth.—The Rev. P. B. Bakewell followed, with remarks of a more special nature in connection with the cause in Northampton; and was succeeded by the Rev. Henry Ierson, of London, who congratulated the Unitarians of Northampton on the improved social feeling which the present meeting indicated. He was pleased to observe the presence of members of other denominations. Most of the unhappy prejudices which divided the several portions of the church of Christ from each other arose from mutual ignorance. The subject which had been placed in his hands, "Liberality of Sentiment compatible with Independence of Thought," suggested naturally the reflection that sectarianism, in its evil aspect of intolerant party feeling, was a disease of the heart, the conceit of ignorant presumption, which could not sympathize with the feelings and the difficulties of others. Whatever parties were thus illiberal, the body to which they belonged should never yield to the temptation of acting towards others as though they believed themselves to enjoy an absolute monopoly of the truth of God. Mr. Montgomery had referred to the liberal movements that were taking place in the orthodox communions, and especially to the publication of the work called "Essays and Reviews" by certain clergymen of the Church of England. They ought not to look coldly upon such writers because they did not fall exactly into the same ranks with themselves. The publication of that work was an event of as great importance to the theology of this country, as the late secession of South Carolina might be expected to prove in regard to the question of physical slavery in the United States. The work contained many things with which he did not agree, but the authors were conscientious and able men. He attached peculiar value to the last essay of the series, by Mr. Jowett, Greek Professor at Oxford, and should be glad to see that paper, on the Interpretation of the Scriptures, brought out in a cheap and popular form. As to the author's Unitarianism, he probably knew nothing, or very little, of their body; and there might be something in their general modes of thought with which these writers did not as yet sympathize—something, also, which we had to learn from them. He did not care himself much for the mere name—Unitarian. They were blamed if they adopted it; they were blamed if they laid it aside. He should use it freely until they found a better, on all fit occasions;

but he could understand the difficulties of the clergyman in question, as he had been himself Unitarian in reality long before he knew anything of Unitarian literature and became aware of the fact. He believed that many friends among the orthodox were at present in the same position; these also should receive the liberal sympathy of the Unitarian body. He could assure them, from his own early knowledge of the fact, that a large proportion of the orthodox communions possessed an honesty and an intelligence which should raise them far above the shaft of contemptuous reproach with which they were often tempted to address them. He remarked with pleasure the substantial identity of the practical religious teaching of the best of the orthodox preachers with that of those whom the Unitarians regarded as their own foremost leaders. There might have been in the past a greater dividing chasm, but certainly the Unitarians were attaining a much clearer and loftier view of the divine side of their own system of thought. But the orthodox did not insist, as they used to do, upon the entire depravity of man, the theological Trinity of equal persons in the Godhead, the peculiar doctrine of the two natures in Christ. Unitarians believed that sin was hateful to the loving Father, and that without culturing care and the aid of heavenly grace, man fell into evil;—while, as to the penalty of wrong-doing, they could not but believe that in the life to come the divine law must continue in force, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." But no theological consistency could ever make a true-hearted mother really believe that the sweet infant at her breast was not the work of God, but a child of the devil, born only to eternal wrath. There was also no real difference in the Father they all worshiped, excepting with many of the orthodox, who did not understand their own theology, and who held Jesus to be the one only approachable God of their worship. There was always a speculative corner in the mind into which to put the terminology of the creeds; but no intelligent Christian man in these days could do other than reverence the one infinite God of nature and of grace, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. There had been persons who conceived also of Jesus as a mere casual man, who, in the providence of the Father, had been employed, as other good men had been before him, in a work of useful service to mankind. This had never been the doctrine of the Unitarian body, who held the man Christ Jesus to stand apart in the purpose of God from eternity, and to have received of the Spirit

of the Father without measure; that he is in truth "God manifest in the flesh," in relation to the great work which he came to accomplish of our regeneration, representing to us God's perfect will and the glorious ideal of what man should become. Any other views than these the Scriptures did not warrant. If any others were made out by inference, he reminded them that this was a process of human reasoning, and that the orthodox, and not the Unitarians, were thus open to the charge of trusting presumptuously to their finite and erring reason, when they parcelled out and labelled the mysteries of the Divine Nature, instead of humbly following the method of the Saviour's practical and simple teaching and example, aiming, together with the Unitarians, to bring mankind to the love and service of the Father. Mr. Ierson proceeded to shew that liberality did not mean indifference to the solemn importance of opinion and the value of truth. If they esteemed their own privileges, they would desire to communicate them. They would be ready to make sacrifices in the cause of truth and righteousness. They had not sufficiently appealed to the masses. They must follow the good example of the clergy and others who were striving nobly and usefully in this direction. He was glad to learn that they had adopted a system of visiting by the ladies of the congregation—an excellent practice, which might be made an instrument of great service in the interest of the cause of truth, which he trusted they all had most sincerely at heart.

The meeting was closed with a hymn and prayer, the visitors being highly gratified with the proceedings of the evening.

UNITARIAN HOME MISSIONARY BOARD.

On Monday morning, January 21st, the annual examinations of the students of the Home Missionary Board were commenced at 11 a. m. in the College rooms, Marsden Street, Manchester. During the proceedings many ministers and other gentlemen assembled in the rooms. Among others, we noticed the Revds. W. Gaskell, M.A., Dr. Beard, H. M'Kean, R. L. Carpenter, B.A., H. Green, M.A., E. Smith, M.A., J. C. Street, J. Drummond, B.A., E. W. Hopkinson, J. Clark, J. Harrop, B. Herford, T. E. Poynting, W. Whitelegge, R. Wilkinson, G. H. Wells, M.A., C. C. Nutter, H. Eachus, A. Rushton, W. Robinson, J. T. Whitehead, J. Wright, B.A., Dr. Davison, J. Heywood, L. Taplin, M.A., J. Gordon, G. Beaumont, S. F. Macdonald, C. Beard, B.A., G. Fox, G. Hoade, W. Binns, T. Hincks, B.A., and Messrs. H. Rawson, J. Armstrong, B. Heape, Dr.

Marcus, I. Mackie, P. Eckersley, R. Nicholson, J. Grundy, P. Gillebrand, T. Worthington, W. Boardman, H. Bright, M.A., J. Dendy, B.A., E. Bowman, M.A., &c. &c.

At eleven o'clock the proceedings were commenced by the Rev. W. Gaskell, M.A., who examined the three junior students, Messrs. Ellis, Whitworth and Timmins, in the Greek of the Gospel of St. Matthew. Mr. Gaskell said that two of them had known nothing of Greek at the commencement of the session. Under these circumstances, the answers given to the examiner's questions were satisfactory. At twelve o'clock, Dr. Beard occupied the desk and examined the whole of the students on the "State of the Roman Empire in the time of Christ." This was a very interesting and valuable course of instruction, and the way in which many of the answers were given by the students to the questions of Dr. Beard shewed the results of conscientious study. The answers of Messrs. M'Master, Mitchell, Oates and Willicott, were specially good. The various questions were answered well, with one or two exceptions, where greater exactness and perspicuity were required. The course of instruction covered in these lectures is of great value in giving sound views concerning the true methods of Biblical exposition.

The next examination was conducted by Rev. W. Gaskell in English History, from the earliest times to the end of the reign of Edward VI. Many of the answers given were full, thoughtful, and well written, and gave evidence of careful study. The best papers were read by Messrs. M'Master, Oates, Willicott, Mitchell and Ellis. The day's proceedings ended about a quarter past five p.m.

On Tuesday morning, at nine o'clock, Messrs. Mitchell and M'Master, the two senior students, were examined in the "Ecclesiastical History of the Unitarian Church," being the subject chosen by H. Bright, Esq., for his prize of £5. The following were the questions :

"1. Who were the Ebionites, and whence was their name derived ?

"2. Quote any passage from Justin Martyr bearing upon the Unitarian controversy.

"3. What does Origen say respecting the Supreme Object of prayer ?

"4. Give a sketch of the life of Arius.

"5. Write out the Nicene Creed, marking the clause specially aimed at the Arians.

"6. What causes led to the decline of Arianism in the East ?

"7. Who were the Socini, and in what do their doctrines differ from those generally held by the Unitarian church ?

"8. Give a brief account of the martyrdom of the Maid of Kent, and what were her religious views.

"9. What evidence have we of the Unitarianism of Sir Isaac Newton ?

"10. What is the present state of the Unitarian church in Transylvania ?

"11. To what causes is the rise of the Unitarian church in the United States mainly owing ?

"12. Who are the chief supporters of Unitarianism in the present day in France and Switzerland ?"

The prize, consisting of Milman's History of Latin Christianity, was adjudged to Mr. M'Master.—At twelve o'clock, Rev. Dr. Beard conducted an examination in the Composition of Sermons. At half-past two o'clock, Rev. B. Herford brought out from the students some practical remarks in an examination on "The Mission in the Home." Many of the papers read were somewhat of a suggestive character, and revealed an acquaintance with the nature and objects of missionary movements. The next subject was "Roman History," by the Rev. William Gaskell. This was one of the most successful of the examinations, shewing close application, careful preparation, retentiveness of memory and accurate composition. Many of the papers shewed independent reading and thought on the part of the students, which gratified those who were present when they were read.

On Wednesday morning at nine o'clock, Mr. Gaskell examined the senior and middle students in the Greek of Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians. The students read with ease and construed with considerable accuracy; and gave, on the whole, satisfactory answers to the very searching questions of their tutor. It was evident that the Greek of the New Testament had become a very interesting study to several of the young men.

At half-past ten, the Rev. John Wright, B.A., examined the whole of the students in "Senior's Political Economy." The papers read were evidently prepared with care; and those of Messrs. M'Master and Oates were very full and accurate, and received the commendation of the tutor. Mr. Wright awarded a prize (given by himself), consisting of a Greek Lexicon and Humboldt's Cosmos, to Mr. M'Master for his success in this department, and said he had some little difficulty in deciding whose papers were best, those of Mr. M'Master or those of Mr. Oates, but he had concluded that upon the whole the superiority was with the former. Dr. Beard then, for an hour, conducted the students through a most interesting subject—"Missionaryism and Unitarianism,

their Relations and Duties." In the afternoon, for two hours and a half, papers were read in Dr. Beard's department on "The Epistle to the Romans," and in Mr. Gaskell's on "English Literature;" both were considered satisfactory, and brought the examinations to a close amid the congratulations of the assembled friends of the Institution.

An interesting address was then delivered to the supporters of the College by Rev. R. L. Carpenter, B.A., one of the examiners. Mr. Gaskell then presented the prize offered by Mr. Bright, who was unavoidably absent, and Mr. Wright the one given by himself; after which Dr. Beard adjudged Mr. Samuel Sharpe's prizes for proficiency in Biblical History, Geography and Antiquities, the first to Mr. M'Master, and the second to Mr. Mitchell. Dr. Beard said he had had some difficulty in deciding between the claims of Messrs. Mitchell and Oates for the second prize.

The usual certificates were then given to Mr. M'Master, who is about to occupy the pulpit at Derby; and to Mr. Mitchell, who is to minister at Hinckley. Rev. T. E. Poynting concluded the proceedings with prayer.

On Tuesday afternoon, the annual business meeting of the subscribers was held. John Grundy, Esq., of Summerseat, presided.

The sixth annual report was read. It referred to the continued usefulness of the Board. During the year, eleven students had been under training, and the report of the tutors was satisfactory; nine new applications had been favourably entertained for admission. During the six years the Board had been in existence, twenty students had been placed in positions of usefulness, but the supply was not equal to the public demand. Pleasure was expressed that the Principal (the Rev. Dr. Beard) had been restored to health. With the increase of students under training, the funds were inadequate to meet the current expenditure. The report then gave a summary of the duties performed by the students during the year. They had occupied 274 pulpits; conducted 806 services; made 259 religious visits; taught 394 times in Sunday-schools, &c.; and 50,000 persons had attended the Sunday services of the students, under the superintendence of the Principal. The statement of accounts shewed that the year had commenced with a balance of £185. 6s. 8d. in the bank, but that it was now reduced to £80. 11s. 11d.

Rev. Charles Beard moved the adoption of the report and Treasurer's account, and in doing so expressed his deep interest in the success of the Missionary Board. The

report shewed that a great deal of good work had been done, but the income was not equal to the necessities of the Institution.—This was seconded by the Rev. Mr. Solly, and supported by Mr. R. Shipman, who urged the necessity of increased subscriptions.—Mr. Heape moved a list of the names of officers for the ensuing year, which was seconded by the Rev. Mr. Gordon; and Mr. Shipman moved the thanks of the meeting to the Rev. H. Green, M.A., and the Rev. R. L. Carpenter, B.A., for their services in conducting the examination.—The kindness of the Rev. Thos. Hincks, of Leeds, was also acknowledged, for consenting to deliver the dedicatory address to the students who had completed their course of study.—The resolutions were passed unanimously, and the meeting closed with a vote of thanks to the Chairman, who, it was stated, had, in addition to his subscription, given a donation of £25.

In the evening of the same day, the annual soirée was held in the Manchester Town Hall. Tea was provided in the A and B committee-rooms, and the meeting was afterwards held in the large room, the chair being taken by Mr. John Grundy, of Summerseat, near Bury, President of the Board. There was a good attendance. The Chairman said it would give the managers of that Institution great pleasure to see so large an audience. It would form, amongst many other things, an answer in the future to the statement that Unitarianism was dead. They undoubtedly were amongst the living, and they were met, he hoped, for the purpose of displaying their sympathy with the operations of the Society, and with a determination to put forth greater exertions to extend its sphere of usefulness. Six years ago the Institution was founded, and from time to time they had had placed before them a detailed statement of the working of the executive Committee and of the progress made by the students. Up to the end of last year, their College had trained some twenty missionaries; and he was glad to say that, although this was what might be called the gross product of six years of labour, they had now upon the books some eighteen students, having admitted at a recent meeting no less than nine candidates for the College, so that the operations of the Institution were likely to become much more extensive, and the demands upon their zeal and liberality much greater than heretofore. He was told that the annual expenses of the Board now considerably exceeded its annual income; and that the donation fund, from which they had been drawing year after year without placing much to that fund, was now all but ex-

hausted. They had a larger number of students than ever; their income was small as compared with what must be the expenses of the current year; and therefore there must be an effort on the part of those friendly to the Institution by a generous support to raise the necessary funds. He could not but feel that the times were most propitious for doing the work which the Board had in view. It could not be said that there were any real obstacles in their way, and if they did not set vigorously to work they would have nothing to blame but their own coldness and indifference. All the pains and penalties that formerly threatened them were now swept from the statute-book, and they were met with nothing but a small and sometimes irritating social persecution, at which in their better humour they might afford to smile. If they were true to themselves, they would not rest satisfied with largely increasing their subscriptions. The time, he believed, had arrived when some effort should be made to place that Institution in a building worthy of the wealth, the influence and the social position of the Unitarian denomination. He confessed he should think ill of the members of his church if they continued to permit the tutors of the Institution to gather around them their future ministers and missionaries in the miserable building in Marsden Street. There was another point to which attention should be directed. Whether they knew it or not, they had set on foot a missionary movement that would re-act upon themselves. They could not go on year after year training young men to the missionary life, and sending them to preach amongst the people, without their being listened to with avidity, and without forming around them congregations that would require the preaching of the gospel as professed by the Unitarians week by week. To meet the emergencies which might thus arise, he thought a fund should be established to render assistance towards chapel-building in those districts not sufficiently wealthy to provide the necessary accommodation for public worship unaided.

Rev. Charles Beard delivered an address on "The Unitarian Church and its Missionary duties;" and addresses on various missionary topics were also given by the Rev. Messrs. Wright, R. L. Carpenter, Herford, T. E. Poynting, J. Drummond, and Messrs. Mackie, McMaster and Shipman. In response to the Chairman's appeal, upwards of £100 additional funds were raised in the meeting. A vote of thanks to the Chairman concluded the proceedings.

On Wednesday evening the dedicatory

service was held in the Cross-Street chapel. The devotional part was conducted by the Rev. S. F. Macdonald, of Rochdale, and the address was delivered by the Rev. Thomas Hincks, B.A., of Leeds. We refrain from giving even an outline of this admirable address, as it is hoped it will be put into the hands of our readers in a complete form.

We cannot conclude our brief notice of the various interesting proceedings connected with the Home Missionary Board College without recognizing the great services which that Institution is rendering to the active life of our church. Fields for missionary labour are opening out before us on every side, and through the instrumentality of this College labourers are being prepared to go forth as heralds of the gospel. May God prosper their efforts!

DONCASTER.

Sir,—I was pleased to see in your number for January a reference to the good work being done at Doncaster by Rev. W. Elliot, and the need of better accommodation for the congregation there. The history of the congregation at Doncaster, and the story of Mr. Elliot's experience in connection with it, are really remarkable. I only wish I could feel at liberty to tell the story as I heard it from his own lips. From a state of most abject degradation (and I am sure those who know the case best will not think that epithet too strong), he has worked up the congregation to something like beauty and strength.

The present chapel is a damp, dingy building, in a corner as damp and dingy. When I was taken into it to preach annual sermons some weeks ago, I, for the first time, had the grim sensation of a man going into a venerable sepulchre.

The whisper about the new chapel came to me on the occasion of my visit, though with bated breath; and the very modest hope was, that perhaps £300 or so could be raised, with the help of the Unitarian public, in three or four years!

I only write, Sir, to say I shall be very much surprised if the said Unitarian public suffers so genuine and thorough a case of need to remain unmet for "three or four years;" and I shall be still more surprised if the brave people at Doncaster are at last put in possession of a chapel only worth "£300 or so." One may well hope that when the people themselves can tell their own story and prove their own heartiness by shewing what *they* are willing to do, they will not long remain unhelped.

Sheffield.

JOHN PAGE HOPPS.

OBITUARY.

Dec. 22, in his eighth year, **ERNEST ESTLIN**, second son of Mr. Jas. **WHITAKER**, merchant, Elmfield House, Huddersfield.

Dec. 24, after a very short illness, at her house, Mottram Road, Hyde, Miss **HANNAH CHEETHAM**, aged 58 years.

Dec. 31, at the house of his son-in-law, P. H. Holland, Esq., Camden Square, London, aged 66 years, **GEORGE SOTHERN**, Esq., late of Norwich.

Jan. 1, at his brother's house, Essendon, Herts, Rev. **CHARLES P. VALENTINE**, formerly minister of the Unitarian congregations at Diss, Norfolk, and Lewes, Sussex.

Jan. 5, at Edgbaston, at the residence of his son, Mr. Clarkson Osler, Thos. **OSLER**, Esq., of Kenilworth and formerly of Clifton, in his 78th year.

Jan. 7, at Evesham, aged 67 years, **JANE**, wife of John New, Esq.

Jan. 8, at his residence, Fairfield House, Adelaide Road, Haverstock Hill, **SAMUEL CLEGG**, Esq., C. E., in his 80th year.

Jan. 10, at Great Yarmouth, aged 83, **ELIZA**, widow of Mr. William **SQUIRE**, late of Sidmouth and formerly of Taunton.

Jan. 15, at Ardwick, near Manchester, aged 81 years, Mrs. **WILLIAMSON**. She formerly was housekeeper of the premises of Manchester New College, Grosvenor Square, Manchester, and was in all the relations of life respected.

Jan. 17, at Warminster, Wilts, **JANE**, widow of the late George **WANSEY**, Esq., in the 68th year of her age.

Jan. 20, Miss **MARY ALCOCK**, of Nelson Street, Chorlton-on-Medlock, Manchester, aged 75 years.

MARRIAGES.

Dec. 25, at the Old chapel, Dukinfield, by Rev. John Gordon, Edwin, eldest son of the late Mr. Thomas **BROWN**, of Stalybridge, to **ALICE**, eldest daughter of Mr. Samuel **BROADRICK**, of Dukinfield.

Dec. 29, at the chapel in the Conigree, Trowbridge, by Rev. Samuel Martin, Mr. **JAMES WICKS**, of Melksham Forest, to Miss **ELLEN HOPKINS**, of Holt.

Jan. 3, at Gorton, by Rev. G. H. Wells, M.A., Mr. **JOSEPH HENSHALL**, of Gorton, to **FRANCES ELIZA**, second daughter of Mr. Samuel **WALKER**, of Manchester.

Jan. 3, at Essex-Street chapel, London, Mr. **ROBERT SMITH JACKSON**, of Islington, to Miss **FRANCES LOUISA RICHARDSON**, of Charterhouse Square.

Jan. 9, at the Mill-Hill chapel, Leeds, by Rev. Charles Wicksteed, B.A., cousin of the bride, **JOSHUA BUCKTON**, Esq., Leeds, to **ELIZABETH**, third daughter of the late William **LUPTON**, Esq., of the same town.

Jan. 10, at Godalming, by Rev. C. R. Dallas, incumbent of Farncombe, **ALBERT HILL**, Esq., eldest son of Edwin Hill, Esq., of Bruce Castle, Tottenham, Middlesex,

and nephew to Sir Rowland Hill, K.C.B., Secretary to the General Post-office, to **HENRIETTA**, third daughter of Thomas **CLARK**, Esq., of Netherwood, near Godalming, and formerly of Edgbaston, Birmingham. — It may be mentioned, with reference to this wedding, that the day selected for the purpose was one of more than ordinary interest to the parties immediately concerned, inasmuch as it was the 21st anniversary of the introduction of Sir Rowland Hill's plan for a universal penny postage, a measure which has secured for him a world-wide celebrity, and will ere long, we may fairly presume, be adopted by every civilized nation on the face of the globe.

Jan. 16, at Christchurch chapel, Banbury, by Rev. J. McDowell, Mr. **THOMAS L. OWEN**, Maidstone, Kent, to **HARRIET HERBERT**, Springfield, near Banbury.

Jan. 16, at the Unitarian chapel, Croft, near Warrington, by Rev. P. P. Carpenter, Ph.D., the Rev. **GEORGE FOX**, of Mossley, to **MARY**, youngest daughter of the late Mr. Peter **EYES**, of Warrington.